United Nations S PV 6299

Security Council

Sixty-fifth year

Provisional

6299th meeting

Friday, 16 April 2010, 10 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Okada	(Japan)
Members:	Austria	Mr. Mayr-Harting
	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Mr. Alkalaj
	Brazil	Mrs. Viotti
	China	Mr. Li Baodong
	France	Mr. Araud
	Gabon	Mr. Issoze-Ngondet
	Lebanon	Mr. Salam
	Mexico	Mr. Puente
	Nigeria	Mrs. Ogwu
	Russian Federation	Mr. Churkin
	Turkey	Mr. Apakan
	Uganda	Mr. Rugunda
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Mark Lyall Grant
	United States of America	Ms. Rice

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Letter dated 1 April 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2010/167)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

10-31721 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Letter dated 1 April 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2010/167)

The President: I wish to welcome the presence at this meeting of the Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Ban Ki-moon, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina, His Excellency Mr. Sven Alkalaj.

I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Afghanistan, Australia, Botswana, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Egypt, El Salvador, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Kenya, New Zealand, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, the Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, the Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor-Leste and Uruguay, in which they request that their delegations be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite the representatives of those countries to participate in the consideration of the item, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, the representatives of the aforementioned countries took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President: On behalf of the Council, I extend a warm welcome to His Excellency Mr. Zalmai Rassoul, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan; His Excellency Mr. Alfred Palo Conteh, Minister of Defence of Sierra Leone; and Her Excellency Ms. Lucia Lobato, Minister of Justice of Timor-Leste.

In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to His Excellency Mr. Peter Wittig, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission and Permanent Representative of Germany.

It is so decided.

I invite Mr. Wittig to take the seat reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mrs. Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, Managing Director of the World Bank.

It is so decided.

I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from His Excellency Mr. Pedro Serrano, in which he requests to be invited, in his capacity as acting head of the delegation of the European Union to the United Nations, to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to His Excellency Mr. Pedro Serrano.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I invite Mr. Serrano to take the seat reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 14 April 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Uganda to the United Nations, in which he requests that the Permanent Observer of the African Union to the United Nations, His Excellency Mr. Téte António, be invited to participate in the consideration of the item in accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to His Excellency Mr. Téte António.

It is so decided.

I invite Mr. António to take the seat reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

I wish to draw the attention of the members of the Council to document S/2010/167, which contains a letter dated 1 April 2010 from the Permanent Representative of Japan to the Secretary-General, transmitting a concept paper for this debate.

I should now like to make an opening statement in my national capacity.

It is a great honour for me to convene an open debate of the Security Council on a very important topic — post-conflict peacebuilding. At the outset, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Ban Ki-moon, and to the ministers and special guests who have travelled a great distance to share their experience and insights at this meeting.

How do conflicts recur even after a ceasefire is successfully concluded? Why does peace not take root in post-conflict countries? These are critical issues to which the international community has yet to find a definitive answer. I believe that the key to solving them is for people in a post-conflict situation to have hope for the future. To this end, how can political stability and security be achieved in parallel with social stability? How can a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy be created, with the assistance of the international community? I look forward to a lively discussion on these points.

When we think about peacebuilding, we should first of all emphasize the importance of political leaders implementing a peace agreement with steadfast determination. It is also important that the fruits of democratic elections, which include political stability, be shared among all the people, including those who did not prevail, and not simply be reserved for the winners. This requires as its foundation the achievement of peaceful coexistence and reconciliation among parties to the conflict. In the States that comprised the former Yugoslavia, especially Bosnia and Herzegovina, which was most heavily affected by the conflict, continuous efforts have been made to that end. Afghanistan, where self-reliant efforts are being made for reconciliation and reintegration, also requires the support and cooperation of the international community.

With regard to security, peacekeeping operations have a significant role to play and lay the groundwork for promoting security sector reform. The building of national police force capacity is an especially urgent task, for instance, in Haiti and Timor-Leste.

We recently lost many of our dear colleagues in the earthquake in Haiti, including Mr. Hedi Annabi, Special Representative of the Secretary-General, and another friend, Mr. Takahisa Kawakami, in Dili last month, who, as the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General at the United Nations Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste (UNMIT), had not yet fulfilled his aspiration to build the national police of that young nation. I call upon the international community to continue the efforts of these dedicated United Nations staff members by striving harder to enhance national police capacity in many post-conflict countries.

In order to break the vicious circle of social instability and prevent the recurrence of conflicts, it is important that conflict-affected people be provided with basic services and thereby enjoy a peace dividend. It is essential, from the viewpoint of human security, to protect and empower individuals, including women and the vulnerable. Refugees, internally displaced persons and ex-combatants must be reintegrated into society. We need to generate conditions that are conducive to making peace irreversible through promoting coexistence and reconciliation.

Youth unemployment is a common issue of serious concern in many countries in the post-conflict stage. I therefore propose that, when assistance is extended to such countries, high priority be attached to the creation of youth employment. Young people represent the future of a country. They should not take up weapons but rather engage in productive work, which will enable them to participate in the reconstruction of their nation and its communities. Thus, they can provide a foundation for socio-economic development, which will lead to the true consolidation of peace.

Creating a long-lasting peace requires sustained cooperation between a post-conflict country and the international community. In this connection, I would like to highlight three points.

First, we should think about how efforts for peacebuilding can be carried out in an integrated manner. In Sierra Leone, the Peacebuilding Commission and the Government of Sierra Leone made concerted efforts to formulate a Peacebuilding Cooperation Framework, which included such socio-economic development measures as energy assistance,

together with measures to create political stability and security. The international community is currently assisting the country under this framework. A framework of this kind should serve as a model for other peacebuilding strategies.

Secondly, the assistance and involvement of the international community may have conflicting impacts on the ownership efforts of a post-conflict country. For instance, will provision of food assistance be consistent with efforts to promote domestic agricultural production? Will the pursuit of justice by the international community advance the effort for national reconciliation? Does the hiring of local experts by international programmes affect the national Government's efforts at capacity-building? If we overlook these issues, the fundamental goal of building the country's self-reliance will not be achieved. The international community must respect the ownership and capacity-building efforts of the post-conflict country.

Thirdly, peacebuilding requires long-term engagement and sustainable resources. We first need to make the best possible use of funds available for the immediate aftermath of a conflict — for example, the Peacebuilding Fund. But such funds must be followed by medium- and long-term resources from bilateral and multilateral programmes. It is also essential to secure and strengthen necessary expertise to serve the diverse requirements of peacebuilding activities, including in the areas of governance and the rule of law. In this regard, we look forward to the work of the Senior Advisory Group for the Review of International Civilian Capacities, launched by the Secretary-General last month.

The Security Council must continue its strong engagement in favour of peacebuilding, and we hope to see the Peacebuilding Commission obtain enhanced results through the ongoing review process. Building on today's debate, Japan will continue to participate actively in the efforts towards achieving sustainable peace in post-conflict countries.

I now resume my functions as President of the Security Council. I now invite His Excellency Mr. Ban Ki-moon, Secretary-General of the United Nations, to take the floor.

The Secretary-General: Thank you, Minister Okada, for taking part in person in this very important Security Council debate and for focusing the attention of the Council on this important subject. I congratulate the delegation of Japan for its success in presiding over the work of the Security Council this month.

In our previous debates, a consensus has emerged on some of the factors leading to success in post-conflict peacebuilding. The report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict that I presented to this Council last July laid them out in some detail (S/2009/304). We must seize the crucial opportunity that is presented at the end of a major conflict. We must respond early and robustly. And we must then stay engaged over the long term. We have also agreed that our collective efforts must be tailored to the needs of each country.

Today I would like to emphasize three points in order to situate our discussion in a larger context.

First, we build peace in the minds and hearts of people. This means delivering concrete peace dividends. Peace will not last unless people see real benefits in their daily lives: safety, justice, jobs and prospects for a better future. In this regard, our work must always be guided by the principle of national ownership.

Secondly, peace will not endure unless Governments in post-conflict countries are able to perform the basic functions of the State and to ensure sustainable security. These functions include policing the streets, upholding the rule of law, establishing a functioning justice and corrections system and delivering basic services. Governments should also be capable of demobilizing and reintegrating ex-combatants, developing a professional security sector and protecting civilians from death and injuries caused by landmines.

Thirdly, we must take a comprehensive approach. That means addressing the security, political, economic and social dimensions. It means engaging national, bilateral, regional and international actors, and it means coherence, coordination and common vision.

The United Nation continues to sharpen its work. We are building partnerships and synergies across the United Nations system and with regional and international actors, with an emphasis on early engagement. This includes a stronger partnership with the World Bank and other international financial institutions.

We are bolstering our capacity to support viable peace processes that produce durable agreements. We are improving our tools for deploying and supporting peacekeeping operations, integrated peacebuilding offices and other field operations that take on peacebuilding tasks.

We are paying more attention to the nexus between peacekeeping and peacebuilding. Peacekeepers themselves are, in an important sense, early peacebuilders. They seize the window of opportunity in the immediate aftermath of conflict. They are the first to set priorities. We must take advantage of their unique yet temporary presence while remaining aware that peacekeepers do not have the resources for long-term development.

The Secretariat is working on a strategy to ensure that critical early peacebuilding tasks, carried out by peacekeepers and others, contribute to longer-term peacebuilding and development. In doing this, we want to draw on the assets of all partners, in particular those from the South.

To this end and following through on one of the recommendations contained in last year's report (S/2009/304), I have asked the Peacebuilding Support Office to conduct a review of civilian capacities for peacebuilding. I have also appointed a Senior Advisory Group, chaired by the former Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Affairs, Mr. Guéhenno. I understand that the Peacebuilding Commission will also provide input to this review, thus ensuring that we capture the views of a broad and unique segment of the membership.

Timely funding is essential. It is vital to have adequate and timely resources for early peacebuilding tasks, including, if necessary, the rapid deployment of standing police and other civilian capacities.

Last year, the Peacebuilding Fund revised its terms of reference so that it would be better positioned to provide the kind of flexible, rapid and predictable resources envisaged in my 2009 report. Since its inception in late 2006, the Fund has provided resources to 16 countries. Eighty-eight per cent of this funding has gone to countries with either peacekeeping missions or political and peacebuilding missions.

The Peacebuilding Fund also serves as a pillar of support for the Peacebuilding Commission, with approximately $106 million allocated to the four countries on the Commission's agenda. I am pleased to announce that this month the Fund will reach $200 million in allocations. With 48 donors and nearly $350 million in deposits and pledges, the Fund continues to make progress, including through the guidance provided by its Advisory Group.

However, the Peacebuilding Fund's value is in identifying priority areas and helping to channel resources to them. By itself, it can not meet the financial needs of countries emerging from conflict.

I therefore urge donor countries to increase their support as bilateral donors, through direct contributions to countries emerging from conflict and as multilateral donors, through the international financial institutions or United Nations agencies on the ground.

The ongoing review of the peacebuilding arrangements agreed to in 2005 is an opportunity to strengthen our work in important ways. Peacebuilding is a complex and multifaceted undertaking. It requires significant amounts of human, financial and institutional resources. But the most important tool we can deploy is the political commitment of national and international actors.

The Security Council has a central role to play. As peacekeeping mandates increasingly include peacebuilding responsibilities, I urge Council members to ensure that the resources provided are commensurate with the tasks assigned, and I urge them to use their great influence and experience to help peacebuilding achieve its potential.

The President: I thank the Secretary-General for his statement. I now give the floor to Mr. Zalmai Rassoul, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan.

Mr. Rassoul (Afghanistan): First of all, let me extend my congratulations to you, Minister Okada, and your country for assuming the presidency of the Council for this month, and thank you for convening this meeting and inviting me to participate. I would also like to thank His Excellency the Secretary-General for his presence here today.

The rebuilding of societies emerging from conflict is one of the biggest challenges to the maintenance of international peace and security and thus among the most important functions of this Council and this Organization. It is also of central

importance to Afghanistan, which struggles on a daily basis to establish peace and security.

In Afghanistan, reconstruction and stabilization efforts began immediately after the fall of the Taliban at the end of 2001. When we first gathered in December 2001 in Bonn, Germany, we began a process that, in five years, would put Afghanistan back on the path towards an enduring stability. Though we were astonishingly successful in achieving the benchmarks set by the Bonn process, we soon acknowledged that further efforts would be necessary to address the magnitude of the challenges we faced. In Tokyo in 2002, London in 2006 and Paris in 2008, we adapted our plans to emerging realities and extended our efforts towards establishing a secure, stable and prosperous Afghanistan.

After three decades of war, Afghanistan's economy was decimated, the State had disintegrated, and the society was bereft of infrastructure or even the most basic necessities of life. Millions had died. Millions more were forced to flee from their country — among them, a large number of technocrats and educated Afghans.

Continuous conflict during this period crippled the social fabric of the country. Further, the ongoing political and social instability bred networks of terrorists, extremists, criminals, drug dealers and opportunistic regional elements that depend on insecurity in Afghanistan and the region. A nexus of drugs, extremism and crime fed on the chaos and anarchy that now seriously threatens our efforts to build peace.

Despite the challenges, we have achieved remarkable success in nine years, establishing a convincing basis for optimism for the future of the country. Afghans have forcefully renounced the totalitarian rule of the Taliban and established a Government through three successful elections, including the most recent presidential election, run entirely by Afghans. The Afghan Government is becoming more efficient and effective every day, and is increasing its capacity to provide governance and services to the people. More than three quarters of Afghans now have access to basic health care. Millions of children now have the opportunity to attend school, many for the first time.

We have addressed the legacy of violence through a comprehensive disarmament and reintegration programme that has successfully reintegrated thousands of former fighters into society. In particular, I would like to recognize and offer thanks for the efforts of Japan in that area, including through the financing of programmes for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration and the disbandment of illegal and armed groups, as well as for hosting a comprehensive conference on peace and reconciliation in Tokyo last November. In addition, we have built and continue to improve the Afghan National Army and Police through recruiting, training and equipping. They are beginning to take primary responsibility for providing security for the people and the country.

In rebuilding Afghanistan's shattered infrastructure, we have built thousands of miles of roads with the help of the Council, as well as hundreds of schools and clinics, local wells, and improved irrigation systems. We have seen immense economic growth. This year, for the first time, the Afghan Government has taken in more than $1 billion in revenues. The average Afghan income has jumped six-fold in the past four years.

Change has also come in ways that are not visible. The Afghan people are more vocal, more engaged and more involved in the future of their country than ever before. We have a vibrant media, an active civil society and well-informed citizens. Social structures are beginning to re-knit and a feeling of national unity is emerging.

We are proud of our accomplishments to date, but we still face daunting challenges. Security remains Afghanistan's number one challenge. Terrorists are still intent on jeopardizing our progress and are trying to take Afghanistan back to the days of tyranny and oppression. In stabilizing Afghanistan, we know that military means are essential. Nonetheless, they are not the only answer. That is why we have embarked upon a comprehensive strategy that includes military, political and economic efforts.

As an important element of our security strategy, the role of international forces and the manner in which they operate are crucial. More needs to be done to ensure the protection of civilian populations. We emphasize the need for the utmost care and precision during combat operations to avoid civilian casualties. It is also essential that international forces conduct their duties with strict adherence to cultural sensitivities and in close coordination with Afghan security forces. By

the same token, we appreciate the new approach of NATO Commander General Stanley McChrystal, which places added emphasis on the protection of the civilian population.

To achieve success in defeating terrorism and improving security, more focus is required to address the main sources of insecurity. The problem of insecurity will not be solved so long as terrorist sanctuaries and safe havens in the region continue to provide terrorists with ideological, financial and logistical support.

Regional cooperation is another essential element in achieving stability in Afghanistan. We continue our collaboration with regional countries — bilaterally, trilaterally and through other forums — to overcome the challenges in Afghanistan and in the region.

Going forward, we must work to ensure the sustainability of our progress economically, politically and socially. Much remains to be done. We must build the capacity of the Afghan Government and the strength of its institutions so that it can stand on its own feet. We still must focus more on improving good governance and fighting corruption. We must guarantee the long-term security of the Afghan people and more fully win their confidence. And we must foster the social well-being that is necessary for stability and peace.

A few months ago, at the beginning of his new term, President Karzai proposed a strategy that was subsequently endorsed by the international community in London at the end of January. That strategy is focused on building lasting, sustainable peace and stability in the coming three to five years through the Afghanization of national ownership and leadership, by empowering and engaging Afghans themselves, by promoting long-term socio-economic development, and by undertaking new regional cooperation.

First, if peace is to be sustainable, Afghans should be involved in their own security. The Afghan national security forces will play a central role. In the coming three to five years, intensified training and recruitment will enable those forces to begin to take the primary responsibility for the security and defence of the country and its citizens, thereby allowing the international community's role to evolve from a primary to a supporting one.

Secondly, the Government of Afghanistan will engage more fully with all Afghan people and address their concerns in order to strengthen national unity and social stability. Improved capacity will allow the Government of Afghanistan to address corruption, strengthen good governance, end the culture of impunity and better serve the Afghan people.

Thirdly, we will offer former combatants and those willing to join the peace process a chance for a peaceful life and a decent future through a reconciliation and reintegration process. That is a good alternative for ending the continuing insecurity in parts of the conflict and an important way of isolating extremists and terrorists and ensuring that Afghans will continue to choose peace over violence.

Fourthly, although those elements will promote peace and stabilization, the only way to guarantee the sustainability of progress is to anchor society on a foundation of long-term socio-economic development. The Government of Afghanistan must be able to fund its programmes, support its people and decrease its dependence on international aid. Job creation and agricultural development in particular are central elements that will cement short-term gains, improve social cohesiveness and promote political normalization. In addition, there must be a focus on education to help build capacity, promote social stability and confront extremism.

A crucial piece of the London strategy is the central role of the Government of Afghanistan in coordinating and leading those efforts as Afghans take greater responsibility for their country. With regard to development assistance, a much better job is required to improve its efficiency. To date, only 20 per cent of such aid has gone through Afghanistan's national budget; 80 per cent of assistance has been channelled on a bilateral basis. In short, we must Afghanize development priorities.

Through improved coordination, we should work to address parallel or competing governance structures, which do more harm than good.

President Karzai's new Afghanization strategy is built upon a workable and reliable partnership between the Government of Afghanistan and the international community. My Government and the Afghan people are very grateful for the continuing commitment and generosity of our international partners and friends. We

recognize that a partnership based on respect and realism is vital to our success.

Understandably, we have different expectations, different timelines and different priorities. We can avoid fragmentation and confusion only through mutual understanding, open communication and an awareness of our shared goals. Our efforts will take time to bear fruit. This process cannot be hurried. In addition to short-term measures, long-term development supported by a committed partnership with the international community is the key to a healthy and sustainable Afghan society that is safe from the risk of recurring conflict.

The President: I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Alfred Palo Conteh, Minister of Defence of Sierra Leone.

Mr. Conteh (Sierra Leone): At the outset, my delegation wishes to congratulate you most warmly, Mr. President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of April. We assure you of our full support and cooperation during your tenure. I would also like to extend our appreciation to your predecessor for his able leadership in directing the work of the Council during the past month. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General for his presence at this debate.

My delegation also wishes to express its sincere appreciation to the Permanent Mission of Japan for organizing this open debate of the Security Council on the topic of post-conflict peacebuilding and developing a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy to prevent the recurrence of conflict. The Government of Sierra Leone appreciates this opportunity to participate in deliberations focused on shaping a comprehensive global strategy on this important issue.

Before I proceed, allow me to convey the profound regrets of my colleague, Foreign Minister Zainab Hawa Bangura, who is unavoidably unable to participate in today's session as originally planned, owing to compelling countervailing events of a serious nature.

As a country that has been fully engaged in the process of post-conflict reconstruction over the past few years, Sierra Leone has gained keen insights into the challenges involved in formulating a comprehensive and sustainable peacebuilding strategy. We recognize, in particular, the urgent need for the international community to assess how best the current architecture, including the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), can be strengthened to ensure a successful transition from peacebuilding to sustainable security and development in countries emerging from conflict.

My delegation shares the ideas in many of the perceptive reflections outlined in the concept note prepared by Japan. Accordingly, I will endeavour to focus my intervention on the key questions highlighted therein and share with you my delegation's views concerning the lessons to be learned from Sierra Leone's own modest experience with post-conflict peacebuilding.

Over the past decade, Sierra Leone has served as a veritable field laboratory for the design and implementation of long-term peacebuilding strategies, as considerable international efforts have been expanded on addressing a vast array of challenges, initiatives and policy options during the country's transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding.

Today, Sierra Leone is on the threshold of the fifth anniversary of the Peacebuilding Commission's engagement in the country, having received catalytic funding through the Peacebuilding Fund to undertake critical peacebuilding efforts over this period.

Key among the challenges the United Nations and the international community have confronted during their engagement in Sierra Leone is the question of how best to devise comprehensive strategies and mechanisms to mobilize adequate support and resources designed to minimize the likelihood of a relapse.

Given the fragility of countries emerging from conflict, the challenges of building lasting peace can only be met with a comprehensive and integrated approach that goes beyond merely establishing political stability and security. In order for durable peace to be achieved, there must be a seamless linkage between those core goals and measures intended to lay a foundation for long-term development and democracy, particularly with respect to governance issues, social stability, human rights and the rule of law.

Unlike current peace operations, earlier efforts in conflict resolution were narrowly focused on crisis management, which allowed for gaps to emerge between the political and security spheres, on the one

hand, and reconstruction and development, on the other. That approach increased the likelihood that conflict countries would degenerate into renewed violence, in that it failed to adequately address the root causes of violent conflict, particularly the interplay between both underdevelopment and weak governance, on the one hand, and intra-state warfare, on the other.

In this regard, contemporary peace operations must focus on tackling the complexities of conflict situations by identifying and supporting structures that consolidate peace, not only during the peacebuilding phase, but also during the traditional peacekeeping period.

Following the Revolutionary United Front rebel barricade of some United Nations troops in the eastern part of Sierra Leone during the early stages of development, the role of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone was broadened to include emergency relief, disarmament and demobilization, the training of the military and police forces, human rights training, the repatriation of internally displaced persons and refugees, and the monitoring of elections. Building lasting peace also requires addressing the root causes of violent conflicts by strengthening Government institutions and enhancing political participation.

On the specific question of what measures can be implemented to achieve political stability, security and social stability in the framework of a comprehensive and integrated approach, I will endeavour to speak about some of the initiatives undertaken in the Sierra Leone and their impact on the overall peacebuilding process to date.

In the aftermath of the cessation of hostilities and the signing of the Lomé Peace Agreement, which paved the way for the successful conclusion of the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme, the Government, in collaboration with the United Nations and other bilateral and multilateral partners, embarked upon a comprehensive sector reform process involving the security and justice sectors.

The Republic of Sierra Leone Armed Forces, for example, were increased from 1,700 to 8,500, and underwent critical training and logistical support led by the International Military Advisory Team (IMAT), which was led by the United Kingdom. Sierra Leone has achieved a significant milestone — the deployment of military and civilian police peacekeepers in ongoing United Nations peace operations.

Similar interventions were undertaken with respect to the national police force, including critical training and logistical support and the rehabilitation and construction of police facilities throughout the country. In addition, the numerical strength of the force was increased from 5,000 to 9,000, with the aim of broadening and intensifying the Government's reach across the entire country for the maintenance of law and order and the enhancement of the respect for the rule of law.

Critical reforms were introduced through the Justice Sector Development Programme, resulting in the enhancement and development of the capacity of the judiciary to dispose of the existing backlog of cases.

All of the foregoing initiatives culminated in a comprehensive institutional reform process encompassing defence, police, intelligence, the judiciary and prisons, aimed at strengthening civilian oversight and democratic accountability of the security apparatus.

Undeniably, the security sector has come a long way in its development and Sierra Leone continues to progressively move towards the establishment of a coordinated security and intelligence architecture designed to allow a participatory approach to assume full ownership and responsibility for the security sector. The underlying principle has been: without security there can be no sustainable development.

The relational dimension of peacebuilding is critical to the attainment of lasting peace and social cohesion. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the Special Court for Sierra Leone were established as instruments to achieve the twin goals of promoting reconciliation and forgiveness and combating impunity.

Adopting a strategy that includes comprehensive measures to protect and promote human rights, strengthen governance and rebuild democratic institutions will inevitably address many of the root causes of conflict. Accordingly, since the formal declaration of the end of the war in Sierra Leone in 2002, a broad array of initiatives within the security-political-humanitarian-development framework have been undertaken to enhance democracy and rebuild

weak or dysfunctional State institutions. All of these efforts have been geared towards laying the foundation for medium- and long-term national recovery, and have enhanced the State's capacity for effective delivery of public services to the citizenry and resulted in positive outcomes for human development.

To date, my Government has worked with the United Nations, in collaboration with our bilateral and multilateral partners, to restore State and local government institutions across the country, completing two presidential and parliamentary elections, as well as local government elections. In 2007, national elections saw the opposition dislodge the ruling party from power. I can say, with great pride, that, although not perfect, most of the strides being made in the ongoing democratization process in Sierra Leone are unparalleled in post-conflict situations in many parts of the world.

The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission in 2005 as an advisory body and as a forum for mobilizing resources and support for the consolidation of peace in countries emerging from conflict, and its subsequent addition of Sierra Leone to its agenda, occasioned a turning point in our peacebuilding efforts. The considerable gains achieved from the engagement with Sierra Leone have clearly enhanced the importance of the Commission's role as a medium for securing resources and galvanizing support for peacebuilding initiatives that are comprehensive, coherent and coordinated and which reflect country-specific realities.

Since the engagement of the Peacebuilding Commission, Sierra Leone has made significant progress in the areas of governance issues, inter-party dialogue, the protection of human rights, and addressing the security threats posed by endemic corruption, drug trafficking and cross-border organized crime.

Security across the country has greatly improved thanks to the vigilance of joint police and military patrols. Several legislative enactments and a constitutional review process have been undertaken to address these and other factors that could potentially threaten the ongoing peacebuilding efforts and the long-term quest for national development, as envisioned within the framework of the Government's national strategy, known as the Agenda for Change.

While we continue to be indebted to the United Nations architecture currently engaged in Sierra Leone and to other development partners for the advances mentioned above, challenges still abound in addressing a number of development, human rights and governance issues. Perhaps most vexing of these concerns are the exceedingly high infant and maternal mortality rates, which are reportedly among the highest in the world, as well as burgeoning youth unemployment in my country. The fact is that, despite all of these efforts, coupled with the engagement of the international community, Sierra Leone remains close to the bottom of the human development index on many key indicators. This is a worrying concern for us.

This brings me to the nexus between security and development and the imperative of addressing the enormous economic and social challenges that beset post-conflict peacebuilding. It is in appreciation of this synergy that my Government has spared no effort in embarking upon a robust sector-wide reform regime, with a view not only to taking advantage of the multiplier effect, but, more important, to enabling us to invest in the development of infrastructure and public finance management. Similarly, we have resolutely pursued efforts to invest in the development of human capital for the furtherance of our social and economic recovery programme, a vital precondition for consolidating peace.

As I conclude my intervention, I wish to reiterate that as much as peacebuilding is a national imperative, there must be a holistic approach to conceiving and managing peacebuilding and preventive efforts, with local ownership, including through regional and subregional actors, playing a pivotal role.

However, it is important to note that, at this juncture, despite the overwhelming interest peacebuilding has generated in the past decade, mobilization of resources for peacebuilding and preventive efforts still remain grossly inadequate when compared to the corresponding commitments to peacekeeping. Of particular importance in this regard is the recognition of the catalytic role that can be played by a meaningful and sequential allocation of financial resources in the early stages of the transition period.

The issue of accessibility to funding for peacebuilding initiatives should be of particular concern as the major assisting nations and financial

institutions all continue to recover from the shocks of the current global financial crisis and economic slowdown, which has occasioned declining support and remittances from donors across the spectrum. Given this stark reality, the international community must urgently consider new approaches and methodologies for allocating and sustaining financing for peacebuilding and national post-conflict reconstruction.

The President: I now give the floor to Ms. Lucia Lobato, Minister of Justice of Timor-Leste.

Ms. Lobato (Timor-Leste): It is indeed an honour for me to represent my Government and my beloved country in this important debate and to present our Timorese experience in recovering from conflict over the past 10 years. I will keep my statement within the time limit, but I have circulated a more detailed text to representatives for the record.

As Minister of Justice, I am able to present a perspective on the development of peace through the legal institutions and the rule of law in my country. But I also wish to discuss some broader aspects of reconciliation, economic development, security and political stability, which are essential. I intend to focus more on the solutions we are providing to our problems than on the problems themselves. Let me share our experience.

This debate is particularly timely for us, as we have just hosted the Dili International Dialogue conference, which served as an opportunity to exchange experiences and find common ground among the so-called g7 Plus — the "small g seven plus" of fragile States. There was strong consensus among fragile countries and development partners to move from fragility to agility and seek greater and more focused engagement with development partners.

We have found that Timor-Leste has much to offer and to gain in the discussions about peacebuilding strategies. While eight years is but a short time since our national independence, we have made many achievements. We addressed some burning issues in the short term that were indeed critical to our recovery. Important social security measures were introduced, including recognition for the heroes of our nation who made sacrifices so that we could be free. Our relationship with Indonesia has been strengthened through initiatives such as the Truth and Friendship Commission and the ongoing dialogue between our leaders. Camps for internally displaced person were gradually and sensitively decommissioned and people were assisted in relocation and rebuilding. The Government intervened to ensure food security when rising rice prices threatened to limit supply.

The police and defence forces began to define their peacetime mandates and work together on joint operations when the internal security of the nation was threatened. The success of this was evident following the 2008 attacks on the Prime Minister and the President of the Republic. Thanks to sound leadership, this crisis inspired our security forces and provided a platform to pursue further security sector reform, greater professionalism and independence from political interference. The police are now adopting a community policing ethos, an approach by which the police serve and work together with the community to identify potential conflicts and to solve problems before they escalate to violence.

Timor-Leste is fortunate to be blessed with income from natural resources managed by the Petroleum Fund, a success story in transparency and good governance. Our Government believes that we need to invest the income we make back into our own country to improve the lives of our citizens. It is hard to explain the sense of keeping money in the bank while our people suffer. We need to create a dividend for peace and stability.

Yes, we have come a long way, but we have also learned many lessons, including some painful ones. We have learned that, without exception, countries can recover from conflict only if they can create a window of time in which they are free from further conflict. In Timor-Leste, we at last have that window, but we are not taking peace for granted. As our Prime Minister, Xanana Gusmão, has recently said,

> "It can be easy to breathe a sigh of relief when you begin to show signs of progress, when you achieve a level of apparent stability, because in times of peace we can forget the hardships of conflict".

We were not only emerging from a violent conflict; we were also, for the first time in our history, creating a new, independent State. In this spirit, I would like to share three observations on peacebuilding from our perspective, grounded in the recent history of Timor-Leste and enriched by pertinent themes from the Dili International Dialogue Conference.

In regard to the need for an inclusive political dialogue, in Timor-Leste we are aiming for a new maturity in political relations. Following independence, the Government set about addressing the roots of conflict. The world will remember that, at the birth of our new nation, our country lay in ruins. We were building our new country on a destroyed infrastructure, a limited economic sector and problematic social cohesion between ourselves and our neighbours. Our people had independence, but its benefits of it were as yet unfelt by many in their daily lives.

Not surprisingly, we faced conflict again in 2006. This conflict set back our development, but also presented valuable lessons. Our political actors learned that the way to our future was not through violence but through positive and active leadership, professionalism and commitment to development. From the 2006 conflict, we arose stronger as a nation, less afraid of expressing political differences, in a process enriching our political maturity without the need to revert to violent conflict. We confront each other every day, but we do so in our national Parliament. In addition, the parliamentary opposition is regularly included in public debates to forge a truly national consensus about issues of common interest to all Timorese, such as the package of major security laws that was approved last month.

As to setting the right national priorities within a flexible and long-term vision, in 2006 Prime Minister Xanana Gusmão and the fourth constitutional Government set about changing the course of Timor-Leste's future. Continued stability depends on our success not only in managing crises but also in forming respected State institutions that address all the needs of our society, from ensuring basic services to reducing poverty. In 2008, we realized that the only way to achieve sustainable development was to coordinate all our efforts. That same year, we presented a set of national priorities for the country.

Those priorities are consistent with the five areas identified as recurrent peacebuilding objectives in the Secretary-General's 2009 report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304). In addition, we include a specific national priority area dedicated to access to justice and another to good governance and accountability, as well as one that deals with human resource development. A focus on youth and gender is mainstreamed into all our priority areas because we have a rapidly growing population which we want to be productive members of society, not alienated or frustrated over a lack of jobs.

We have reviewed our national priorities on an annual basis to ensure that we are adaptable to the changing situation. With the improvement in the security situation since 2008, we have been able to shift our priorities for 2010 to infrastructure and rural development. To provide an umbrella for this and prepare us for the long term, the Prime Minister is finalizing a strategic development plan for 2011-2030 that will ensure the coordination of all development activities in the country for the next 20 years.

Concerning justice and the rule of law, we know that one of the foundations of a stable and secure society operating within the rule of law is a respected justice system, whereby the rights and obligations of the State and its citizens are understood by citizens and are enforceable. We aim to give particular attention to the voices of vulnerable groups, especially women and children. Timor-Leste has also consistently prioritized the building of strong institutions of justice that complement the work done in policing and security sector reform. Justice cannot be neglected in our progress towards long-term security, peace and economic development.

A fortnight ago, the Council of Ministers endorsed a strategic plan for the justice sector, following a highly participatory process. This process informed and subsequently took account of the recommendations of the 2009 independent comprehensive needs assessment, facilitated by the United Nations. The justice sector strategic plan can be explained by its motto, "Bringing justice to the people", and in order to achieve that we have addressed five thematic areas, which are covered in more detail in the written version of this statement: institutional development; the completion of Timor-Leste's legal framework; the development of human resources; creating an infrastructure and applying information and communication technology; and providing access to justice.

We see justice as a fundamental part of this debate on peacebuilding and the prevention of conflict. Let me quote Pope John Paul II, in his address for the 2002 World Day of Peace, when he said that there is "no peace without justice, no justice without forgiveness". Forgiveness is not the opposite of justice. In fact, true peace is the work of justice. We are

working on a justice system that safeguards the rights of all citizens, including by providing legal remedies where their rights have been violated. We also acknowledge that there is no justice without forgiveness. While our country ensures the rule of law, we want to tell the Council that we suffered for many years, and in some cases the wounds are still fresh. We need to help heal these wounds, and we need to do so in our own way and in our own time.

As there is no peace without justice, there is also no peace without development. To conclude, I would like to share some important points.

Concerning the question of quality over expedience in capacity-building, in Timor-Leste we were criticized many years ago for choosing quality over expedience in preparing judicial actors, but we can now show results, and we encourage this principle to be applied as the only way of achieving confidence in State institutions.

On the alignment of all foreign development support to our development plans, in order to reach a lasting peace we still need support. Initiatives such as the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund could help us enormously. We highly appreciate the assistance of our development partners, including the United Nations Development Programme, all of which are now working with us as close associates rather than as far-away donors. We know that we are not alone. In order to achieve development, we cannot allow the existence of uncoordinated or competing implementation mechanisms. The only way to create confidence among our people and sustainable progress is to ensure that the development agenda is led by the Timorese leadership, taking the national dialogue to all parts of the country. Peacebuilding must be a genuinely national process if it is to be a productive element for stability and reconciliation. A process of national consultation led by the Prime Minister will begin in rural areas next month.

Concerning the adoption of modern, user-friendly technology, we need to automate Government services and make them more accessible to the public, more transparent and more accountable. Developing countries may at times be offered clumsy, outdated solutions, as we were in Timor-Leste, because people think we are not ready for modern technology. We do not agree with that thinking. We need to jump into the future. Recent advances in technology have resulted in systems that are more intuitive and easy to use, and we need to go straight to these solutions. Many of our people are already comfortable with technology, and we are working with our partners to ensure that they are trained to develop, support and adapt systems owned by Timor-Leste. In addition, we need to use environmentally friendly technology. Here, we can learn from the mistakes of our development partners. We can keep the beauty and the resources of our countries while advancing towards peace and stability.

With regard to strengthening the partnership between Government and civil society, the growth and progressive impact of our civil society organizations have demonstrated the engagement of the people of Timor-Leste. Timorese civil society has evolved from providing humanitarian support to representing the voices of the most vulnerable. It is inspiring to see more and more young people volunteer to serve their communities and join the fight for peace and justice.

To achieve peace, we must fight not conflict, but the causes that might lead us to conflict. While some States have taken centuries to build their State institutions and achieve social and economic development, we must do it in decades. As our Prime Minister has stated,

> "To unite an entire people who have been scarred from conflict in the struggle for peace is more difficult than to achieve unity in times of conflict. As we know, there are so many legitimate expectations from people who have fought for so many years for the ideals of freedom, equality and development that we can say that achieving true peace also means freeing people from poverty."

In Timor-Leste we believe that peacebuilding and development are not abstract words or theories, but as tangible and real as a hand to hold. My friends and colleagues in the Security Council took my country's hand when we reached out to them at the start of our journey and helped pull us out of war. Our famous Timorese spirit survives and grows, and I now offer our hand again and ask for theirs as true partners in development, so that we can walk together along the road to a lasting peace and a brighter future in Timor-Leste.

The President: I now give the floor to Mrs. Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, Managing Director of the World Bank.

Mrs. Okonjo-Iweala: I bring greetings to all present from the President of the World Bank, Bob Zoellick, who regrets that he could not be here today. I particularly want to thank you, Mr. President, for bringing us together to discuss this most important issue and for inviting the World Bank to contribute. I also wish to thank the Secretary-General for his strong leadership of the United Nations family on this issue.

As 2015 fast approaches, the world's attention is turning to progress in achieving the Millennium Development Goals. The analysis that the World Bank has commissioned to inform its 2011 world development report on conflict and fragility confirms a disheartening fact — countries that are wracked by conflict and that suffer endemic fragility are not making the progress they need if the Millennium Development Goals are to become a reality for their people.

We are all aware of the desperate needs of these countries. Our research suggests that fragile States and those recovering from fragility account for only 37 per cent of population of developing countries if we exclude China, India and Russia. However, they account for 58 per cent of poverty in the developing world, as well as 67 per cent of infant deaths and 69 per cent of the deaths of children under five. Our analysis indicates that no fragile State has yet achieved a single Millennium Development Goal. By 2015, only 10 per cent of fragile States are expected to achieve the goal of halving poverty and hunger.

Against this backdrop, today's debate is a most timely one. These findings are a stark reminder of the enormous and complex challenges that lie ahead, but they are also a call to mobilize our combined resources on behalf of the poor and powerless.

Violent conflict is one of the most profound development challenges. Without peace and security, there can be no sustained development, as we have heard from our colleagues who spoke earlier. However, focusing on peacebuilding alone is not sufficient. Just as development cannot occur in the absence of peace, peace without development is a peace that may not last.

In recent years, the international community's discourse addressing violent conflict and its consequences has become more nuanced. We increasingly recognize that humanitarian action, peacemaking, peacekeeping, peacebuilding, State-building and development do not happen in a mechanical linear sequence, but are closely interlinked and overlapping. Such a complex landscape calls for cooperation and coherence among actors. It challenges us to address the short-term demands of a deeply damaged society while making sure that our actions do not compromise the longer-term goal of building an effective State.

Against this background, I would like to propose one overarching principle that must inform all that we do — results matter. By this, I mean that all that we do must contribute directly to results on the ground. Whether we are working in our headquarters offices to shape a new policy, engaging with a partner Government on a national development plan, or rebuilding a road for a war-ravaged community, we must constantly ask a single question: How will these actions provide people with a better life now and in the future?

The Government of Burundi clearly understands the importance of results. In 2006, with the support of the World Bank Institute, it introduced a rapid-results approach. This approach, which breaks down long-term development plans into manageable 100-day chunks, is now applied in 80 Government projects. A pilot project in the Ministry of Education resulted in the distribution of 250,000 textbooks to primary schools in 60 days, when previously this had required an entire school year. As part of a health care pilot project, 482 pregnant women visited health centres and were subject to HIV/AIDS screening in one month — far in excess of the previous monthly average of 71.

As we debate here on some of the best ways to get results, I would like us to focus on three crucial areas: country context, partnership and accountability. I believe that if we pay attention to these three areas, we will be able to contribute something substantial and enduring towards the immense challenges of helping countries create an environment of peace and security. Let me briefly elaborate on these three points.

First, it is about country context. Of course, we must learn from and build on our experience but, in the urgency of a post-conflict environment, it is often too tempting to simply apply a solution that worked elsewhere. We must guard against trying to replicate what we have done in the past without ensuring that it is appropriate to the present context. We must guard against any prescription that prevents adaptation and

flexibility. We need to do a better job of understanding the drivers of conflict and to understand the structure of elite incentives. We must also identify each country's fundamental strengths, comprehend the limits of its capacity to absorb change and act on what that knowledge tells us.

The World Bank-supported Justice for the Poor programme works to support the development of context-specific approaches to improving access to justice in South-East Asia, Africa and the Pacific. In Sierra Leone, the programme, along with other national and international efforts, is helping to scale up grassroots justice services. Trained community paralegals employ a combination of mediation, education and advocacy, and occasionally litigation, to seek redress for violations of rights. They engage both customary and formal institutions and provide a flexible, cost-effective method for delivering justice services that is tailored to Sierra Leone's particular socio-legal context. The Government is establishing a legal aid board, which will recognize and certify the paralegals, and it is expected that, within five years, about 100 community paralegals will serve all 154 chiefdoms in the country.

Our coordination efforts must be driven by our need to deliver meaningful results. I know that some see comfort in predictability — that our response in post-conflict situations would be improved by predetermining who does what. I must challenge that notion. While it is important that we recognize where our overall comparative advantage may lie, it is essential that our response should be determined by the dictates of the situation and our relative capacity to deliver in the particular context of the partner countries. Predetermination could easily result in inflexibility at a time when adaptability and nimbleness are most needed. Decisions must be delegated to where the best information is and be made at the lowest effective level. That means that we need to put our best people into the field, for it is our field staff who are best placed to decide, in consultation with their country partners, who should do what, when and how.

Secondly, partnerships are key. We must recognize that achieving a sustainable peace and setting in train a broad-based agenda for development are ultimately the work of a State and its citizens. We at the World Bank and in the development community need to be humble and to remind ourselves that we play a supporting role. We provide our resources, expertise and security assistance so that a people may be able to take back the reins of Government. The only credible coordinator of a State-building process is a legitimate sovereign Government. Our assistance must be shaped to support the country in mobilizing the human and material capacity that it has at its disposal to provide the services that its citizens need. That will mean many things for us. For example, we must pool our funding wherever possible to maximize coherence and reduce the burden on the Government, such as through multi-donor trust funds. We must support and work through the national budget and strengthen national fiduciary systems. We must use our comparative advantages and tailor our efforts to local needs and preferences, and we must reach agreement with our country partners on when it is appropriate to press for change and when we should stand back to allow a population to determine the need for reform.

Just as we need to strengthen our partnership with the countries that we seek to assist, we need to look too at our own partnerships. Are we working together effectively to achieve the results expected of us? The World Bank has recently appointed a senior envoy to Haiti, and a similar appointment to the Sudan is expected soon. Those will strengthen our partnerships in the field in countries in particular need. We are heartened by the support that we and the United Nations have received from the Swiss Government, which will enable us to exchange senior officers between the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office and the World Bank's Fragile and Conflict-Affected Countries Unit to help facilitate and deepen our complementary efforts.

My third point is that we are all accountable. While Governments must ultimately be accountable to their citizens for what they do, we must do everything that we can to reinforce that line of accountability. Running a parallel service delivery programme may give us results in the short term but it will not contribute to, and may even undermine, efforts to build the social compact that lies at the heart of a well-functioning State.

Shifting accountability also requires us to change the way that we monitor our efforts. We must get away from our traditional preoccupation with tracking inputs and focus our attention, and that of our partners, on achieving outcomes. Confronted by an uncoordinated and poorly performing health-care system, the Afghan Ministry of Public Health has established a basic

package of health services, delivered through community health workers and health centres. For the first time in many years, Afghans, particularly in rural areas, are seeing the delivery of valued health services made possible by a committed partnership between Government and local providers. Access for the people living in districts where the programme is being implemented has increased from 9 per cent in 2003 to over 80 per cent now. The most recent data for 2008 shows a fourfold increase in the number of outpatient visits to a level three times higher than in a neighbouring country. The programme has also seen a decrease in the under-five mortality rate from 257 per 1,000 in 2000 to 161 in 2007 to 2008.

In the spirit of mutual accountability, we too should be held accountable for what we deliver. For example, if we demand transparency in our partners, we should expect to provide it ourselves. In that regard, I am pleased to report that the World Bank has adopted a new Access to Information Policy that will open up the Bank's work even further, enhance public ownership of the development agenda, strengthen partnerships and encourage greater participation in Bank-supported operations.

So, as we turn to our deliberations today, I would ask us all to keep those three points in mind: the importance of the country context, true partnerships and appropriate accountability. I know that such ideas may sit uncomfortably with our limited appetite for risk and our need to demonstrate to our domestic constituencies the quick wins expected in an immediate post-conflict period. It is clear to me that addressing the challenges of development through such lenses will require fundamental changes to the way in which we do business.

Fortunately, the next few months will bring a number of opportunities to reshape and improve the way in which we do business. For example, the Secretary-General will report on progress since launching his report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304) last June, and, at the end of the year, the World Bank will present its World Development Report on the themes of conflict and fragility.

Let us make no mistake. If we are to deliver real results for the people living in fragile and conflict-affected situations, those areas deserve our full attention. We know that the costs of failure are great, but let us bear in mind that the benefits that flow from success can be even greater. Starting with our deliberations here today, let us take every opportunity to ensure that success.

The President: I shall now give the floor to the members of the Security Council.

Mr. Alkalaj (Bosnia and Herzegovina): At the outset, I would like to commend you, Minister Okada, for convening this meeting to discuss the topic of peacebuilding in post-conflict countries. I am confident that our deliberations today will significantly contribute to one of the most important items on the Security Council's agenda. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General, Mr. Ban Ki-moon, as well as my colleagues, Foreign Ministers, for being here today, and we all anticipate valuable contributions. It is my honour to speak on behalf of Bosnia and Herzegovina, a country that has travelled the painful and difficult road from recipient of to active participant in United Nations peacekeeping and peacebuilding efforts.

We recognize the importance of peacebuilding operations as a means of strengthening peace and security in the host country, thus contributing to creating conditions conducive to achieving sustainable and irreversible peace. In order to realize this goal, peacebuilding operations should be based on an integrated, coordinated and comprehensive approach to include the establishment of good governance, the rule of law, the promotion of human rights, institution-building, security sector reform, economic reconstruction and development. The right to return to pre-conflict homes and the full reintegration of refugees and internally displaced persons through sustainable returns programmes must be an integral part of each and every peacebuilding strategy.

Peacebuilding activities require active interaction among all stakeholders, including the host country, donor countries, troop- and police-contributing countries, international financial institutions and the private sector. Furthermore, although we are of the view that all relevant national and international actors should be involved in the process of peacebuilding, we consider the political will of the host country and national ownership to be sine qua non conditions for the success of peacebuilding operations, given that the peacebuilding process is primarily the challenge and national responsibility of post-conflict countries.

In that regard, we believe that it is of the utmost importance to promote dialogue between the parties to a conflict, particularly among decision-makers and civil society organizations, in order to move the peacebuilding process forward and away from recurring conflict. Such a dialogue is critical to national institutions and capacity-building, as well as to confidence-building and the reconciliation process. Holding accountable all those who have committed crimes during a conflict and bringing them to justice is of equal importance to confidence-building and the reconciliation process, and hence could contribute significantly to the success of the social aspect of peacebuilding operations.

Organizing free, fair and transparent elections could be an important part of the process of creating political stability and establishing a democratic system, the main preconditions for reconciliation and reintegration processes, as well as for achieving sustainable and irreversible peace. Therefore, the utmost attention ought to be paid to their thorough preparation, including by facilitating the registration and full participation of voters, particularly internally displaced persons and refugees.

Bosnia and Herzegovina stresses that restructuring the security sector requires balance between international support and national ownership. Sustainable security involves strengthening institutions and processes, while a well-governed security sector is vital to overall peacebuilding and reconstruction efforts, as well as to development. Building a well-managed security sector that is sustainable requires not only police and military reform, but also impartial and accessible judicial and law enforcement sectors that must rely on transparency, equality, civilian protection, democratic norms and respect for human rights.

The disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) of former combatants are indispensable elements of all peacebuilding operations. The availability of arms and alienated and dissatisfied former combatants represent a permanent risk of recurrence of conflict. Hence, DDR programmes should be a broader part of planning for development and reconstruction. Furthermore, in a situation where an early peace dividend is evident and generally accepted, the security sector is well managed and democratic norms are in place, there is also a window of opportunity for development in the true sense. Job creation measures, vocational education and retraining programmes for such vulnerable sectors such as returnees, youth, national minorities or demobilized combatants, as well as activities aimed at empowering women, should be in place. The role of women and their involvement in peacebuilding efforts should be strengthened in post-conflict societies.

Bosnia and Herzegovina emphasizes that peacebuilding strategies should be defined and owned by national stakeholders, with a clear implementation plan and benchmarks. In this context, the role of various agencies, funds and programmes should be defined and coordinated and best practices established. It is of key importance that external actors do not prescribe but advise, and this can be done only through a transparent and open process, with the assistance of the international community.

Political stability and security together, with social stability, will reduce the risk of recurring conflict only if it is integrated into a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy. Bosnia and Herzegovina welcomes the strengthened regional and international cooperation in addressing issues of drug-trafficking, organized crime, terrorism and trafficking in human beings. A coherent and integrated approach is essential not only in terms of combating these threats to peace and security, but also with regard to building reconciliation, coexistence, trust and stability at the regional level.

Finally, the road from an initial peace agreement to sustainable peace is long and winding. Travelling it requires an integrated and comprehensive approach, country-specific planning and strategy, as well as coherent implementation and the strong and steadfast commitment of both the host country and the international community. The peacebuilding initiatives that worked in Bosnia and Herzegovina were marked by synergy among multiple actors and, most important, between civilian and military endeavours.

I should like to conclude by saying that, in our work, we should focus more on preventive diplomacy and lessons learned in order to prevent conflicts, rather than dealing with post-conflict situations, which are always more costly in terms of human life and physical and economic destruction. On behalf of my country, I would like to reiterate our readiness to share the knowledge, experience and lessons learned regarding post-conflict peacebuilding in every situation where

our country's first-hand experience can be seen as relevant, reliable and useful.

Mr. Churkin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We are pleased to welcome you, Sir, to the presidency of the Security Council.

We have listened with interest to the statements made today. The difficult challenge to Governments in post-conflict crisis situations requires the development of balanced strategies to resolve them, based on the interrelationship between the issues of security, socio-economic development and the protection of human rights. We need a comprehensive approach that enables the achievement of sustainable peace and ensures that conflicts do not recur. There is no other alternative. There is no doubt, however, that peacebuilding activities must be based on the principles of national responsibility for identifying the priorities and approaches to implementing the strategy.

Assistance in any form from the international community should be extended with the agreement of national Governments and in respect for the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity. Ultimately, the specific characteristics of each country must be taken into account.

In successful post-conflict peacebuilding, it is very important to strengthen national institutional capacities. The United Nations undoubtedly plays a special role in coordinating international efforts in post-conflict socio-economic development. We understand very well that such activity presents many difficulties and that the United Nations Secretariat, programmes and funds, Member States, regional organizations and international financial institutions must be involved. In that respect, we support the Secretary-General's resolve to improve the Organization's effectiveness in post-conflict response, to strengthen the Secretariat's organizational mechanisms and to coordinate its work.

Many early peacebuilding tasks — such as security sector reform, disarmament and demobilization — are currently undertaken by United Nations peacekeeping operations. In assuming the main task of facilitating peace processes, United Nations peacekeepers play a critically important role in establishing conditions conducive to more comprehensive peacebuilding. We must bear in mind that peacebuilding is a long-term and multifaceted process that extends far beyond the framework of peacekeeping operations. In the light of the increasingly complex and multifaceted nature of peacekeeping mandates, it would be desirable for peacekeepers to be assigned only the primary task of peacekeeping.

We should draw upon the Peacebuilding Commission, regional organizations, the international financial institutions and donors and involve them in post-conflict peacebuilding. Here, we consider that the Peacebuilding Commission should focus on coordination, especially in areas that need particular attention in a post-conflict context. Its work should be complemented by mechanisms for cooperation with national Governments. We trust that the ongoing review of the Peacebuilding Commission will facilitate strengthening its coordinating role.

We support measures for enhancing strategic coordination between the United Nations and the World Bank, which is an important partner for the Organization in the peacebuilding sphere. We attach importance to the Peacebuilding Fund as an emergency financing mechanism in support of long-term peacebuilding mechanisms.

Peacebuilding requires close cooperation among the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. We consider that the draft presidential statement prepared by the Japanese delegation will facilitate the strengthening of that kind of partnership, and we support its adoption.

Mrs. Viotti (Brazil): Mr. President, we are honoured by your presence today. It is also an honour to welcome Ministers from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Afghanistan, Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste, as well as the Managing Director of the World Bank.

I would like to thank the Japanese presidency for having organized this thematic debate and for having prepared the draft presidential statement that we will adopt later today. We fully support it.

This debate comes at a very timely moment, as we engage in the review of the Peacebuilding Commission and move forward in the implementation of the recommendations of the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding and early recovery (S/2009/304).

The peacebuilding architecture of the United Nations aims at integrating political stability, security and socio-economic development. That integrated

approach is a solid foundation for our work. However, while this premise is well established in our discourse, it still needs to be made fully operational in our practice.

We are learning by doing. In the work of the Guinea-Bissau configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission, which I have the honour to chair, the need for an integrated approach to simultaneously tackle those three dimensions of peacebuilding is evident. In order to surmount the recurrent political instability in that country, security sector reform stands as a matter of utmost priority, alongside the strengthening of State institutions. At the same time, efforts to revitalize the economy are indispensable: at the end of the day, they will ensure the much needed jobs to allow for stability to take hold and the fiscal revenues that will enable the State to function in an autonomous manner and provide basic services to the population.

We welcome Foreign Minister Okada's proposal that, in peacebuilding strategies, high priority be attached to the creation of youth employment.

Another sine qua non condition for effective peacebuilding is the notion of national ownership. In a country emerging from conflict, however, ensuring national ownership can be particularly challenging. On the one hand, it is essential for the State to take the lead in the peacebuilding process; on the other, capacity constraints usually get in the way, making it necessary to build institutional capacity as the process moves forward. In that regard, we welcome ongoing efforts aimed at establishing pools of civilian capacity to be expeditiously deployed on the ground. Needless to say, such pools should not replace existing local capacity, ought to resort to experts from developing countries as much as possible, especially from the region of the country concerned, and must help to develop national capacity in post-conflict countries.

Our collective experience in peacebuilding suggests that such efforts must not only be undertaken simultaneously in different domains, but must also start very early in the post-conflict process. There is an emerging consensus that peacekeeping and peacebuilding are not sequential forms of engagement, but rather a continuum. In this regard, we welcome the potential contribution of the Peacebuilding Commission to countries in early recovery and encourage greater coordination between the Security Council and the Commission. The potential role the Commission can play in early post-conflict situations should be explored more actively, especially with regard to the linkages between security and socio-economic development.

Peacebuilding is a collective and multidimensional effort. Adequate coordination is therefore central to effective peacebuilding, but it remains a formidable challenge. The first task is to share information among actors on the ground concerning the activities that are being undertaken. Such information-sharing should lead to a distribution of labour to ensure coherence in plans and actions, both in the field and at Headquarters. This is, of course, easier said than done. The challenge is to persuade donors and partners to participate in a coordinating exercise under the leadership of the country concerned and to align their assistance to national priorities. Overcoming this challenge will greatly enhance the effectiveness of our individual and joint endeavours in peacebuilding, to the benefit of post-conflict countries.

Another important aspect of peacebuilding efforts has to do with developing strategic partnerships with regional and subregional organizations, in the light of the inherent regional nature of many situations that need to be addressed. Engagement with international financial institutions is also very important, given the mutually reinforcing role of the activities of those institutions and of those related to peacebuilding. Greater involvement of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund in peacebuilding and their growing partnership with the United Nations system are most welcome.

Peacebuilding efforts will not bear fruit if they are not supported by effective financing mechanisms. It is imperative to envision funding arrangements capable of channelling substantial resources in a timely manner. We welcome the role played by the Peacebuilding Fund in providing catalytic support to post-conflict countries, which must be complemented by other sources of longer-term financing. In this regard, we believe the activities of the Fund can benefit from greater synergy with the work of the Peacebuilding Commission.

We look forward to the results of the ongoing review of the Commission. The review process has been an excellent opportunity to take stock of the

progress achieved thus far and discuss ways to improve the Commission's work. We hope it can lead to a Commission that is placed at the centre of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture, endowed with a strong secretariat, capable of garnering all the available expertise within and outside the United Nations system, able to foster coordination among various actors and flexible enough to deal with the manifold challenges related to peacebuilding processes.

To some extent, peacebuilding is a new frontier for the multilateral system, as we still have to set up or improve institutional arrangements, establish adequate procedures and create political constituencies around the globe. Formative periods can be challenging, but they are also promising. We are at this precise moment in peacebuilding. The single most important factor to determine our success will be our ability to effectively integrate stability, security and development into coherent actions adjusted to the concrete needs of each situation. This is no small challenge, but it is one that is worth embarking on.

Mrs. Ogwu (Nigeria): My delegation wishes to express its profound appreciation to the delegation of Japan for convening this timely debate on the important theme of post-conflict peacebuilding. We are also honoured by the presence here today of ministers from Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste and the Managing Director of the World Bank.

Mr. President, your choice of theme has provided an opportunity for the Security Council to contribute to the series of events targeting the review of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) five years after its establishment. We believe that the outcome of this debate can make an important contribution to the mandated review of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

The year 2010 is a pivotal one for peacebuilding. First, the African Union has declared 2010 the Year of Peace and Security in Africa. Secondly, the World Bank's *World Development Report 2010* will focus on the issues of conflict and fragility. It is also the year that the Secretary-General will issue his first progress report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict. These activities, combined with the Council's previous discussions on this subject, will, we hope, underline the importance of peacebuilding as an integral pillar of peace and security.

I would like to highlight five main points in this debate. First, national capacity and ownership are vital to ensuring lasting peace. We stressed this point a few days ago in the context of the presence of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in that country and ardently believe in its applicability to other countries emerging from conflict. Ensuring ownership on the basis of capacity is a challenge that we all recognize and should strive to meet.

Although peacekeepers are often called upon to support this effort, their role is essentially a gap-filling measure. It is important, therefore, for national Governments and other actors in peacebuilding to better understand the very thin line between peacekeeping and peacebuilding responsibilities.

Secondly, a comprehensive approach to peacebuilding requires partnership, consistency and coherence among the various actors. For a partnership to be strong and effective, it must be grounded in a shared vision and common objective. As Member States engaged in peacebuilding, we need to be consistent and coherent in the policies that we promote and, indeed, speak with one voice on this issue, regardless of the setting and place of discussion.

Nowhere is there greater need for this approach than in the interactions between the United Nations, World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization aimed at enhancing the goals of peace, security and development in the aftermath of conflict. In our opinion, our shared vision of and common objective for peacebuilding should guide the various programmatic activities and enable the different actors to adapt and respond to emerging challenges, notwithstanding their operational mandates and reporting lines.

Thirdly, threats to peace have cross-border implications and linkages, often demanding broader efforts and mechanisms at the regional and subregional levels. This is not only true of conflicts in West Africa, but is the case in most regions of the world. For this reason, we would like to emphasize the need to pay due attention to the regional dimensions of peacebuilding. Peacebuilding cannot be achieved using a short-term strategy. It requires a comprehensive and integrated strategy responsive to needs and priorities, as well as the long-term commitment of all actors at the national, regional and international levels.

Fourthly, the PBC should have a central role in sustaining a monitoring commitment to peacebuilding activities. Monitoring for its own sake will be of little use if it does not seek to focus attention on an end-state. Consequently, the PBC should aim to keep international focus on the end goals of peacebuilding. The PBC is not an abstract entity. In essence, it is made up of member States with a political will. As such, we should demonstrate through our words and our deeds that we truly own and cherish the institution. Its strength or weakness will be measured in large part by the quality of our political commitment to the institution and its cause.

I believe that we should seize the moment in 2010 following the PBC review to regenerate momentum around peacebuilding. We would also need to alert our individual Governments to the need to invest in peacebuilding if we are to help countries emerging from conflict to sustain their peace. The review should help us reinvigorate the vision of 2005 on the basis of the experience gained from engaging countries on the PBC's agenda.

Lastly, if the PBC is to serve its intended purpose, it will require substantive support, expertise and institutional linkages within the United Nations system and beyond. Strengthening the capacity and role of the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) should be the first step in the direction of positioning the Office to provide such support and build such linkages. The PBSO could also assist the PBC in promoting partnerships for peacebuilding.

Let me conclude by reiterating our support for the delegation of Japan's initiative to convene this debate and the critical importance of feeding its outcome into the PBC review. We support the draft presidential statement to be adopted at the end of today's debate.

Mr. Araud (France) (*spoke in French*): I would like to thank His Excellency Mr. Okada, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, for being here with us today, and Japan for having organized this open debate on the wide-ranging subject of peacebuilding. I also thank Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan and Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Minister of Defence of Sierra Leone, the Minister of Justice of Timor-Leste and the Managing Director of the World Bank for their presence and statements this morning.

France associates itself with the statement to be made by the representative of the European Union.

The United Nations is devoting all its political, military, humanitarian and development instruments to developing an effective strategy to prevent countries that have been weakened by war from reverting to conflict.

First of all, peacebuilding strategies should be defined on the ground in cooperation with local authorities. National ownership is an essential aspect of their success. As emphasized by the Secretary-General in his report of June 2009 (S/2009/304), these efforts should be based on the efforts of the countries involved, taking into account local, national and international capacities available.

The London Conference on Afghanistan in January thus restated the international community's long-term commitment to the Afghan people and authorities on the basis of a road map to accelerate their assumption of sovereign responsibility.

The establishment of lasting peace in a country emerging from conflict involves greater consistency in strategies and the participation of all peacebuilding actors, including United Nations agencies, international financial institutions, non-governmental organizations, national Governments or civil society organizations.

However, the coordination role falls first and foremost to the Peacebuilding Commission, which we created five years ago. This subsidiary advisory body should ensure that actors and resources can be better coordinated. Today, we must note that the outcomes achieved in this regard could and should be improved, and that will be the challenge of the review process that we have initiated.

Indeed, the United Nations peacebuilding architecture should be able to respond to the realities on the ground and to meet the expectations of Member States by setting out the priorities areas to be dealt with by all of the actors on the ground. The Peacebuilding Commission should become this central, recognized element that we all hope for, both in New York and on the ground, and both within the United Nations and in the international community as a whole.

The Peacebuilding Fund, which was established in parallel with the Commission, could play a catalysing role by mobilizing bilateral and multilateral donors. However, we must meet not only immediate

needs but also more long-term ones, and that is one of the main difficulties that faces us in terms of peacebuilding. We must be able to simultaneously anticipate, act and develop our strategies in order to ensure that countries do not relapse into conflict.

Beyond the cases that the Commission has before it, we can work on improving coordination between all the actors within the United Nations family, particularly in countries where peacekeeping operations or special political missions are deployed. This is the case with the Democratic Republic of the Congo, for instance. New, custom-made tools, such as integrated strategic frameworks, enable us to better coordinate the efforts of all actors for the benefit of the countries where peacebuilding remains necessary.

To conclude, I would like to recall that peacebuilding does not necessarily depend on an official emergence from conflict. The unfortunate example of Timor-Leste has revealed that drawing down a peacekeeping operation too rapidly and not managing the transition process carefully enough can lead to a resumption of conflict. In order for durable strategies that are applicable in the immediate and long term to be implemented, peacebuilding should be clearly understood as one dimension of peacekeeping and not just as the step that follows it.

The Council debate that France organized on 12 February 2010 highlighted the importance of including the peacebuilding dimension from the outset of a peacekeeping operation. Stepping up relations between the Peacebuilding Commission and the Security Council might also bring about a strengthening of the relationship between peacekeeping and peacebuilding. The Commission review process will make it possible to enhance the Commission's efforts and furnish the United Nations with a truly effective tool to ensure that countries do not relapse into conflict.

Mr. Rugunda (Uganda): Let me begin by thanking you, Foreign Minister Okada, and the delegation of Japan for organizing this high-level debate on the important issue of post-conflict peacebuilding. I also thank the Secretary-General, the honourable ministers of Afghanistan, Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste and the Managing Director of the World Bank for their statements. We also welcome the participation of the Foreign Minister of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

This debate, which is taking place during the review of the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, is both useful and timely. The United Nations, regional and subregional organizations and the wider international community continue to be preoccupied, and rightly so, with issues of post-conflict peacebuilding.

Uganda underscore the importance of developing comprehensive peacebuilding strategies so that countries emerging from conflict are supported in their move towards sustainable peace, economic recovery and development. This comprehensive approach is essential if post-conflict countries are to avoid a relapse after peacekeeping operations. For peacebuilding strategies to be successful, they must be designed to address a particular conflict situation. We can never have a one-size-fits-all approach, although broad parameters for most conflict situations have been identified.

What is critical is that a comprehensive strategy should, first, be nationally owned; secondly, address the root causes of the conflict; thirdly, leverage national, regional and international resources to support in a coordinated way the implementation of identified peacebuilding priorities; and fourthly, address the provision of peace dividends, including basic services.

Our experience in Uganda has shown us the importance of identifying national priorities based on the country's unique situation and conditions.

One of the lessons we learned is that it is important to prioritize and sequence peacebuilding activities, starting with the most urgent and critical elements, including security sector reform, reconciliation, economic recovery and reconstruction. To ensure sustainability, building and strengthening national institutions and developing local capacity are key prerequisites.

Peacebuilding is a collective endeavour and a shared responsibility, in which national authorities, regional and subregional organizations, the United Nations and the wider international community have important roles to play. The need for mobilization of adequate, flexible and timely funding for peacebuilding activities does not need to be emphasized again. We therefore welcome the ongoing strengthening of strategic partnerships between the United Nations, the World Bank and other financial institutions.

In conclusion, we reiterate the need to ensure that peacebuilding activities are considered at an early stage in conflict situations and that all actors work within a well-coordinated and coherent framework. Uganda supports the adoption of the draft presidential statement on peacebuilding.

Sir Mark Lyall Grant (United Kingdom): I would like to welcome you, Mr. President, to the Security Council today and to thank you, both for presiding over this important debate today and for the excellent contribution that Japan's delegation makes to the Council's work. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General and the ministerial and other participants today for sharing their particular insights. It has been especially valuable to hear the perspectives of countries taking important steps on the long and challenging path to rebuilding themselves.

Peacebuilding is at the heart of this Council's work. In some senses, everything we do in this Council is about building peace. We give it different labels, depending on the specific task at hand. But conflict prevention and peacekeeping are all part of this broader goal of sustainable peacebuilding, and it tests every resource — political, security and development — that the United Nations can deploy. As the minister from Sierra Leone said earlier today, we need to look at the rebalancing of resources between conflict prevention, peacebuilding and peacekeeping. The ultimate goal for us should be to strengthen the capacities of countries emerging from conflict to drive forward their own recovery processes and address the very difficult governance, security and development challenges they face.

As we discussed in the Council debate in January under the French presidency, the transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding is not a linear one. Countries at risk of relapsing into conflict need to be able to provide sufficient security and access to justice, and be able to resolve conflicts peacefully to allow for the departure of peacekeeping troops. International support for that process is not just about offering barracks and boots. Integrating combatants who were previously fighting each other in a new army, ensuring the discipline of that new army and then putting it under proper civilian oversight can be daunting tasks for a new Government overseeing a fragile peace process.

Those elements alone are insufficient. Successful peacebuilding needs real progress on providing basic services and economic recovery. That must start as soon as possible after a peace agreement is reached. Delivering that requires leadership and vision from within the country itself. The United Nations, and in particular the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General, has a key role in bringing the United Nations system and the wider international community systems — political, security and development efforts — behind a common nationally owned strategy.

So how can the United Nations and the broader international community deliver more effectively? In the coming months, I believe, we should focus on three issues. First, we need to improve the speed and quality of deployable civilian experts to help build national capacities. As the Secretary-General said earlier today, the recently launched review of civilian capacities needs to generate practical solutions.

Secondly, we need greater clarity on the roles and responsibilities within the United Nations and a strengthened partnership with the World Bank. That will allow us to make the right investments in order to achieve more timely and predictable responses in such areas as support for re-establishing the basic functions of a State.

The conclusions of both those strands of work need to be included in the Secretary-General's follow-up report on peacebuilding. That report should include a frank assessment of what is, and what is not, working on the ground.

Thirdly, we need a Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) that has real impact on the ground. The PBC's focus should be on helping countries to address the barriers to peacebuilding and on getting clear commitments from Governments and the international community about what needs to be done in a defined period of time to help achieve that. And we need the PBC to have a much more distinctive voice when providing advice. The Council should have an opportunity to listen to that advice when discussing peacebuilding and peacekeeping issues. The PBC review provides an opportunity for us to establish that practice.

The Council was due to visit the Democratic Republic of the Congo this weekend. Unfortunately, that has had to be postponed for climactic reasons. But

we hope we will be able to reinstate that visit soon. We think that the Democratic Republic of the Congo will be a real test of the international community's ability to move from a primarily peacekeeping presence to a broader peacebuilding role. That will require the United Nations system, the international financial institutions and the wider international community to play a more significant role in helping to restore a State and to support it in addressing critical peacebuilding needs.

History is littered with collapsed or faltered peace processes, some of which are due to underlying governance and rule of law issues not being addressed. When such threats emerge, the Council needs to be able to react rapidly to prevent further deterioration. The United Kingdom supports the draft presidential statement that is before the Council.

Mr. Apakan (Turkey): First of all, I wish to welcome you, Sir, and to commend Japan's presidency for organizing this meeting. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General and the Managing Director of World Bank for their substantive briefings, which included valuable assessments and recommendations on how to develop post-conflict peacebuilding processes. We are particularly honoured by the presence of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Afghanistan and Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well that of the Ministers of Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste.

The concept note provided by Japan (S/2010/167) includes pertinent questions that encompass a wide range of issues on the peacebuilding agenda. It also provides food for thought for future discussion. In that respect, I shall today limit my intervention to four points that we deem to be of particular importance. Moreover, the draft presidential statement that is before us includes a number of measures relevant to post-conflict peacebuilding. We fully support it.

The challenges we are addressing today are not new. For over a decade, we have grappled with how to bring peacebuilding upstream and how to mount a more rapid and effective response in the immediate aftermath of a conflict. Although the challenges aggravated by global resource constraints remain formidable, the renewed enthusiasm on the part of Member States and the international community, as well as the impetus gained so far through the reform of United Nations peace operations, have brought about added optimism for a new peacebuilding agenda.

In our view, the new peacebuilding agenda requires, first and foremost, recognition in practice, not just in rhetoric, of the substantive and inherent linkages between peace, security, stability, development, human rights and the rule of law. That, in turn, compels us to take complementary, integrated and properly sequenced actions in all those areas, so as to achieve a catalytic impact on the outcome of our peacebuilding endeavours.

Indeed, peacebuilding requires well-calibrated action, not only in various policy areas but also with regard to short-term, medium-term and long-term goals. That was also one of the messages of the Secretary-General's report last year (S/2009/304). We agree with the Secretary-General's conclusion that decisions taken in the short term should not prejudice medium- and long-term peacebuilding, but that they should be mutually reinforcing.

Recognizing the nexus between peace, security and development leads me to the second important element, which is the necessity of deciding upon a comprehensive strategy and a political-strategic compass that is designed to support viable peace processes and political, economic and social stability. In other words, that strategy should be an integrated one that merges the tools of peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding. It should also be coherent, adapted to the needs of a situation and well-coordinated vis-à-vis the various actors involved in peacebuilding.

The lessons learned from various peacebuilding challenges reveal that, where such an integrated strategy is missing, the international peacebuilding agenda is bound to be ad hoc, piecemeal or even contradictory, if not outright counterproductive. In the Balkans, for example, the shared peacebuilding framework involving military, diplomatic, economic, legal and social instruments of the European Union, NATO, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the United Nations made collective and concerted action possible; whereas in some regional conflicts in Africa, the absence of such a framework at times hinders the success of the peacebuilding project, despite continuous international assistance and high volumes of aid.

This brings us to the third important element, which is ownership of the process. Undoubtedly, peacebuilding is ultimately a home-grown project and

the realization of its goals requires the active engagement of local stakeholders. This would not only avoid the criticism that it has been imposed on the national Government and population, but also would increase the chances of its success.

Therefore, any mechanism for building durable peace and justice must be applied with the active participation of all local stakeholders, including civil society, marginalized groups, ex-combatants, professional associations and women's organizations. This is particularly significant in terms of social reconciliation efforts, where grass-roots structures play a catalytic role.

At the regional level, neighbouring countries and regional factors should also be brought into the picture. Given that many conflicts have cross-border dimensions beyond the domestic political circumstances, the scope of conflict analysis and response has to be broadened, not only conceptually but also geographically. Of course, the concept of ownership will remain abstract, unless it is accompanied from the very beginning by capacity-building support on the part of the international community.

While the components of any peacebuilding strategy should be tailored to specific situations, the basic pillars on which the international community can lend its support remain more or less the same. Four important elements come to fore for the realization of sustainable peace in a post-conflict situation: restoration of a functioning State, i.e. ensuring basic safety, security and services; rebuilding the legitimacy of the State by ensuring the democratic accountability of political leaders to their citizens and strengthening the rule of law; promoting social reconciliation to heal the wounds of conflict; and revitalizing of the economy.

This leads me to my fourth point, namely, that the United Nations has a unique role to play here, one that could merge the State-centred and human-centred approaches in all these areas and coordinate the work of various stakeholders to deliver as one on the ground. The Peacebuilding Commission, with its unique position allowing it to explicitly address the nexus between security and development, could play a critical role in this respect. Furthermore, the United Nations can also serve as a clearing house for financial, in-kind and technical support at the bilateral and multilateral levels, where all the stakeholders could interact with each other on their individual projects and programmes. The Security Council also has an important role to play in signalling strong international attention and support for the peace process and for the initiation of peacebuilding.

I would like to conclude my remarks by emphasizing that the new peacebuilding agenda highlights the need to operate at many levels, from the micro community to the macro political level, from the national and regional levels to the global level. This is why we should go beyond State-centric concepts of security and move to multi-faceted and multi-level strategies that can help address the multiple causes of conflict from a long-term developmental perspective.

Mr. Puente (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Like other delegations, I would like to begin by welcoming your presence here, Mr. President, and express our gratitude for your country's initiative in organizing this open debate on a subject that is of utmost importance to this Organization, namely, peacebuilding and, particularly, in adopting a comprehensive global and strategic approach. I would also like to greet and thank Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, the Ministers Zalmai Rassoul, Alfred Palo Conteh, Lucia Maria Lobato and Dr. Okonjo-Iweala for their illuminating statements and thank the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Bosnia Herzegovina for his presence.

Today's session affords us a fine opportunity to consider the importance of avoiding relapses into conflict in post-conflict situations. We firmly believe in post-conflict prevention and reconstruction and in the importance of strengthening the link between security and development in the transition to peace from a conflict situation, taking into account the key elements established by the countries themselves. A positive advance in this regard, is the recognition by the Security Council that it is necessary to incorporate coherence and integration into the establishment of peace, peacekeeping and peacebuilding and development in order to ensure a prompt and efficient response to post-conflict situations and avoid a relapse. We support peacebuilding measures that will be incorporated in a timely fashion in the mandates of peacekeeping operations.

The peaceful settlement of a conflict does not, in itself, guarantee that the risk of a resumption of violence will be eliminated. It is essential to establish

the necessary conditions to guarantee lasting stability and security. It is as important to initiate peace, as it is to maintain it and ensure that it is sustainable.

Security sector reform is an important priority, since it allows for the prevention of new outbursts of instability and relapses in violent conflicts and makes it possible to strengthen the human rights framework, which, in turn, contributes to economic and social development. For my country, peace and justice are inextricably linked in an integral solution to conflict. Therefore, no crime should go unpunished, and mechanisms should be established to investigate and clarify possible violations of international law by any of the parties involved in conflicts. This is an essential component in achieving national reconciliation and durable peace.

Security and justice, however, should be built on a political foundation. We recognize that the holding of elections is an important aspect of conflict prevention, peacebuilding and establishing permanent peace. This certainty has been reflected in our participation in Lebanon, Timor-Leste, Haiti, Iraq and Bosnia and Herzegovina, with an effort to back the efforts of the Governments of these countries to strengthen their electoral institutions. If we fail to acknowledge that the structural factors of a conflict, such as poverty, social and economic inequality, are severe obstacles to achieving sustainable development, then we loose sight of important tools for achieving lasting peace, eliminating poverty and promoting development and equal opportunity. It is also necessary to incorporate into early action attention to basic needs, such as housing, education, health, food and jobs as part of the tools of peacebuilding.

We consider it essential that all these aspects be based on the understanding that the primary responsibility pertains to the country involved. Therefore, it is important that any strategy be aligned with the national priorities of each country. The international community has a crucial role to play in the first post-conflict stages, but it is necessary that the application of these principles be adapted to the existing realities in each case, in particular, the political, economic, institutional, social and cultural conditions that prevail in the country in question.

We have frequently underscored the importance of establishing national peacebuilding strategies formulated through a broad-based advisory process involving all national, regional and international stakeholders, both within and outside the United Nations system, including donor countries and financial organizations, in order to ensure greater consistency in peacebuilding efforts.

However, the coordinated implementation of these efforts has been somewhat neglected, despite its great importance in guaranteeing a lasting peace. In this context, a body like the Peacebuilding Commission has enormous potential. With a view to contributing to these matters, my delegation, together with our colleagues from Ireland and South Africa, will facilitate the 2010 review of the Peacebuilding Commission — an exercise which we hope will have a positive impact on peacebuilding processes.

In conclusion, I express the support of my delegation for the draft presidential statement that we will adopt at the end of this meeting.

Mr. Salam (Lebanon): At the outset, I should like to thank you, Mr. President, for having organized this open debate, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan for having honoured us with his presence. I should also like to join my colleagues in welcoming the Ministers from Bosnia and Herzegovina, Afghanistan, Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste, and the Managing Director of the World Bank. I should also to thank the Secretary-General for his insightful remarks.

After 15 years and a dozen major operations, peacebuilding remains a vast, complex and only partially successful experiment. Important lessons have been learned along the way, yet there is still much that we need to learn about building the conditions for a durable peace in war-torn States.

A commonly agreed upon element of peacebuilding is the need for a coordinated and integrated strategy that defines critical peacebuilding priorities. Such strategies should be forged at the country level through dialogue with national actors. The alignment of action and the resources behind it is critical to successful peacebuilding. Due to the increased complexity of post-conflict reconstruction processes, it is fundamental that this strategy be flexible and subject to timely review according to evolving peacebuilding priorities and developments on the ground.

Perhaps the most common criticism of peacebuilding to date has been that international

agencies are not sufficiently sensitive to the unique characteristics of each host country. Indeed, a particular institutional solution or sequence of events is not necessarily appropriate in one country simply because it has been used with relative success in another conflict-affected country. Countries have unique histories and traditions of social organization, which create different challenges and opportunities for conflict resolution. Therefore, it is not possible to develop a generic blueprint for peacebuilding engagement. Such engagement should be context-sensitive and address the underlying causes of the conflict.

The main objectives of peacebuilding are establishing security, building confidence in a political process, expanding core national capacity and achieving socio-economic development, as we all know. It is important, however, to identify the activities which best contribute to achieving these objectives according to the country-specific situation and its actual needs. Since these objectives are interdependent and mutually reinforcing, it is of fundamental importance that the peacebuilding framework be clearly articulated and ensure coherence among the objectives, whether at the level of planning or of implementation.

Ensuring security and preventing new eruptions of violence are the foremost goals of any peacebuilding process. Without the reasonable assurance of physical security for the bulk of the population, there is little hope of achieving progress on institution-building, inter-community reconciliation, reconstruction or development. Therefore, security sector reform is essential and should be nationally owned from the outset. Effective security sector reform requires effective disarmament; the creation of security forces that are well trained, disciplined and politically neutral; and a security sector that is under the civilian oversight of a democratic Government.

A basic level of political will and commitment on the part of national actors is a precondition for peacebuilding. Political issues that remain unaddressed or only partially addressed by peace agreements may call, after such an agreement is signed, for sustained mediation efforts as part of a coherent approach to peacebuilding. Successful peacebuilding efforts require the promotion of a participatory process of healing and reconciliation through inclusive dialogue.

Initiating change in the political culture of a society is one of the most difficult aspects of any post-conflict transition. It requires long-term strategies involving large segments of society and could include extensive education, sensitivity campaigns and consensus-building within society. These more intangible aspects of peacebuilding are frequently overlooked in favour of more technical rebuilding and assistance. Nonetheless, they are essential to long-term change. The people must be at the heart of any search for solutions to conflict and efforts to consolidate peace.

A poor governance framework will undermine the sustainability of peace. Thus, it is essential that the peacebuilding process advance and support the establishment of democratic, transparent and accountable governance and the reconstruction of well-functioning State institutions. The delivery of early peace dividends includes the provision of basic services. Countries in conflict often experience a serious deterioration in or even the complete destruction of their systems of governance, service delivery and economic production. Successful peacebuilding requires helping societies to reverse these trends.

Peacebuilding also requires coherent responses to the needs of vulnerable people through programmes and services to reintegrate repatriated refugees and ex-combatants into civil society, to resettle internally displaced persons and to assist war-affected populations in general. Women, in particular, are key to peacebuilding. Their full participation in the peacebuilding process, both as victims of conflict and as important drivers of recovery and development, is essential.

But how do we ensure that peacebuilding efforts are perceived as legitimate in the eyes of those they are trying to help? The answer is to maximize local ownership by involving populations as quickly and extensively as possible in their own governance. National actors are the engines and the drivers of the peacebuilding process. They are able to identify the most pressing needs of their society and the most effective means of addressing them. Hence, national authorities must take primary responsibility for re-establishing the key institutions of security, governance and economic recovery, with the support of the United Nations and international partners.

Since the greatest resources for a durable peace are always rooted in the local people and their culture, this peace should be built from the bottom up by enhancing sustainable citizen-based peacebuilding initiatives and by opening up public political spaces in order to allow institutions of civil society to flourish. To this end, peacebuilding efforts should promote initiatives that incorporate citizen-based activities, including community peace projects and other grassroots initiatives, in order to empower civil society and to deepen its capacity for non-violent social change.

Financial resources are, of course, essential prerequisites without which effective leadership, common strategies and more predictable support capacity remain only theoretical paradigms.

Finally, when large-scale violence ends, the challenges facing the leadership and people of a country are enormous, and peace is often very fragile. International support in such complex and rapidly evolving situations is of fundamental importance and requires Member States and international organizations to align their assistance and engagement in support of an early and prioritized peacebuilding framework in a flexible and predictable manner.

Civil wars, by definition, are fought primarily within the boundaries of a single State, but they are rarely isolated from political and economic dynamics in the surrounding region. Violence in one country is often part of a larger, regional constellation of conflict. Hence, the importance of cooperation with regional organizations, given the transnational nature of many peacebuilding challenges. The Peacebuilding Commission is the main United Nations platform for international engagement in post-conflict countries; we look forward to this year's review, which will provide an opportunity to improve the Commission's effectiveness in fulfilling its mandate and enhancing its relationship with the Council.

Lebanon supports the adoption of the draft presidential statement on peacebuilding.

Mr. Mayr-Harting (Austria): My delegation is grateful to Japan for having organized this important debate under the presidency of Foreign Minister Okada. We are also grateful for the presence and statements of the Secretary-General, the Foreign Ministers of Afghanistan and Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Minister of Defence of Sierra Leone, the Minister of Justice of Timor-Leste and the Managing Director of the World Bank.

Austria associates itself with the statements to be delivered by the representatives of the European Union and the Human Security Network later in this meeting.

How to make the best possible use of the window of opportunity in the immediate aftermath of conflict is not only the critical challenge for countries emerging from conflict, but also a critical challenge for the international community at large. It is crucial to long-term peace and stability and the realization of early peace dividends. Decisive action aimed at achieving durable peace and long-term sustainable development must be undertaken from the earliest stages onwards and go hand in hand with the possible deployment of integrated peacekeeping missions.

In order for peacebuilding measures to prove successful, generating national ownership must be at the centre of all efforts. Peacebuilding activities should therefore draw on existing national capacities while at the same time assisting the development of effective civilian capacities, including the identification of opportunities and capacity-building for local private sector engagement. A stronger involvement of the local private sector should also be considered in the context of procurement activities for peacekeeping operations. This would support the provision of social stability through economic opportunity, thus contributing to the irreversibility of the peacebuilding process.

Key priorities in the immediate aftermath of conflict include the protection of human rights, the re-establishment of the rule of law, the inclusive implementation of peace processes, the reintegration of refugees and internally displaced persons, effective disarmament, demobilization and reintegration — including of children associated with armed groups — as well as security sector reform. The establishment and support of effective and independent justice and reconciliation mechanisms is a precondition for ensuring accountability for past abuses. They will contribute to justice and long-term peace, as well as to the reconciliation of war-torn societies, thereby minimizing the risk of future outbreaks of violence.

We are convinced that peacebuilding can be successful only if all sectors of society are included. In accordance with Security Council resolutions 1325 (2000) and 1820 (2008), all activities in the field of peacebuilding must be mindful of the vital role women

play in re-establishing post-conflict societies. In this regard, I also fully support what was just said by my Lebanese colleague. The specific needs of women must be reflected in peace agreements and their involvement in participation in the development and implementation of post-conflict strategies assured. This should be complemented by the allegation of gender-specific funds.

Civil society should play a greater role in the early stages of peacebuilding. We will focus on new concepts of cooperation between military and civilian actors at the forthcoming 3C Conference to be held in Vienna on 5 and 6 May. Enhanced coordination at the national, regional and international levels, as well as ensuring mutual accountability, are prerequisites for avoiding duplication and ensuring efficiency. To secure the success of our engagement, we must coordinate with all partners having a comparative advantage on the ground. Cooperation with regional and subregional organizations, such as the European Union and the African Union, as well as with the international financial institutions, must be intensified.

Austria acknowledges the crucial role of the Peacebuilding Commission in addressing a country's post-conflict needs. The experiences of countries on its agenda underline the necessity of involving the Commission from the outset. Peacekeeping and peacebuilding must be considered in a coherent and parallel manner rather than sequentially. In this context we welcome the fact, for instance, that the United Nations Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste, which is a peacekeeping operation, is already integrating peacebuilding aspects into its work, thus helping to bridge a potential gap between peacekeeping and later peacebuilding efforts there.

We would welcome increased interaction between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission, more particularly when the Council works on mandates for United Nations missions. We are confident that the ongoing review process will strengthen this relationship and enable the Commission to make full use of its advisory role and the important contributions it can make to this process. In this context, we believe that Sierra Leone — and that is a point that has already been made a number of times — is a model case for peacebuilding with the support of the Peacebuilding Commission. The Government's commitment to creating long-term peace and stability, with the firm support of the international community aligned behind the country's agenda for change, as well as the United Nations Joint Vision, emphasizes the principle of national ownership and helps to avoid duplication through enhanced coordination.

Finally, I would like to thank the Japanese presidency of the Security Council for preparing the draft presidential statement, which has Austria's full support.

Mr. Wolff (United States of America): My Government is pleased to participate in this debate on post-conflict peacebuilding. Foreign Minister Okada's personal participation and the Secretary-General's direct involvement illustrate the importance of this debate. We are also pleased that the Managing Director of the World Bank joined this discussion. We strongly support closer cooperation between the United Nations and the World Bank in the field of peacebuilding. We also welcome the Foreign Minister of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and we are especially honoured by the presence of the Foreign Minister of Afghanistan, the Defence Minister of Sierra Leone and the Justice Minister of Timor-Leste. We thank them for sharing their insights. It is entirely fitting that the Security Council should begin its debate by listening to those on whose shoulders the success of peace processes rests: the national authorities and peoples of conflict-afflicted countries themselves.

National authorities in post-conflict countries face some of the most difficult challenges on Earth. They need to govern in ways that win the confidence not only of their supporters but also often of their former enemies. They must protect their citizens and uphold the rule of law in situations emerging from violence, where impunity and abuses have often been the norm. They need to provide basic services and economic opportunities for their population, while often relying on poorly equipped and inadequately paid staff. Like so many of our colleagues, we believe that it is essential for peacebuilding agendas to be nationally led and nationally owned.

Given the magnitude of the challenges that post-conflict Governments so often face when they seek assistance from the United Nations and other multilateral and bilateral actors, we need to respond more rapidly, more effectively and more efficiently. The Secretary-General's June 2009 report (S/2009/304) presented an agenda for doing just that, and we look forward to receiving his progress report and further

concrete proposals on how to move forward. We look forward to his forthcoming report on the role of women in peacebuilding, and the review of the Peacebuilding Commission will afford us a further opportunity to reflect on the issues raised during this timely debate.

I would like to highlight three areas today: personnel, peacekeeping transitions and the politics of peacebuilding. First, we need to ensure that the international personnel we send into post-conflict environments, especially at senior levels, have the right qualifications, arrive when needed and stay long enough to make a difference. National authorities must be able to count on the good offices of a wise special representative and United Nations team to help keep a political transition on track and to provide advice on a comprehensive, long-term peacebuilding strategy. They should be able to turn to development experts experienced in post-conflict situations to advise them on the best way to jumpstart an economy ravaged by war. They should be able to call in experts to get a district office, police station, local court, prison or government payroll system up and running, to name just a few of the governance and early recovery challenges that require specific expertise.

The United Nations has seasoned experts in many critically needed areas, but it does not have enough of them. Recruitment systems are not nimble enough to tap the potential found both inside and outside of the United Nations system. Several Member States, mine included, are developing national civilian response capabilities. These respective efforts need to be harmonized, and we are encouraged that the Secretary-General has convened a senior advisory group to review international civilian capacities for peacebuilding. We look forward to the review's results, which we hope will be fully synchronized with the ongoing discussions on the global field support strategy and continuing reform of the United Nations human resources management system.

Secondly, we need to focus on peacebuilding activities that pave the way for the responsible departure of international peacekeepers and related personnel. Last week in Dili, post-conflict countries issued a declaration asking us to respect their unique paths to lasting peace and to work with them to build the national capacities to achieve just that.

We often hear, as we did from our speakers today, that when national authorities seek external aid, they do so within the context of achieving self-sufficiency. In particular, post-conflict Governments prefer to rebuild their own criminal justice sectors and security institutions as quickly as possible, rather than rely on the indefinite presence of even warmly-welcomed peacekeepers and outsiders.

United Nations peace operations, United Nations agencies, international financial institutions, regional organizations and bilateral donors all play an important role here. But we must do more to learn the lessons of past successes and setbacks in our efforts together in Afghanistan, Sierra Leone, Timor-Leste, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia, Haiti and elsewhere, and improve the coherence of our collective response.

Thirdly, international peacebuilders can better support national authorities when they understand the political context in which they operate — another theme we have heard from others today. Even in countries far removed from armed conflict, the adoption of a national budget, the financing of new roads and bridges, or the overhaul of the defence sector can be a complicated and contentious political exercise. It can be even more so in ones where disputes over national identity, wealth and power may have recently triggered outright violence.

It is tempting to approach institutional reforms or resource allocation only as a technical exercise, but in doing so one risks provoking conflict rather than reducing it. When national actors warn us of lurking dangers, we must listen. Similarly, the international community must have the courage to share its own concerns with our partners about ways in which their actions could undermine a peace process or threaten regional stability. To remain in a position to offer critical yet constructive advice, United Nations personnel, donors and Council members must pay more attention to the political dimensions of peacebuilding.

I thank you, Sir, and the Government of Japan for convening this important and timely debate.

Mr. Issoze-Ngondet (Gabon) (*spoke in French*): At the very outset, I wish to tell you how delighted I am, Sir, to see you preside on behalf of your country, Japan, over this ministerial debate on a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy to prevent the recurrence of conflict. I also welcome Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, who wished to participate personally in this debate, and thank him for his significant contribution.

I also thank the Ministers of Afghanistan, Timor-Leste and Sierra Leone, for their illuminating statements, which showcased the significant achievements of their respective countries. Finally, I welcome the participation in this debate of Mrs. Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, Managing Director of the World Bank, and fully appreciate the valuable support of her institution for the Peacebuilding Commission.

We appreciate the relevance and timeliness of this debate, at a time when the danger to countries emerging from conflict of relapsing into a continuous cycle of violence has become even greater. This approach to preventing the recurrence of conflict ties in with our philosophy in terms of crisis prevention, as reaffirmed by the President of the Gabonese Republic, His Excellency Mr. Ali Bongo Ondimba, in the statement he made on 8 March here in New York on conflict prevention in Africa.

The decision taken by the heads of State and Government at the 2005 World Summit to establish the Peacebuilding Commission resulted from their observation of gaps in the transition from activities to re-establish security and post-conflict reconstruction. Thus, at a time when the Peacebuilding Commission is engaged in reform and in evaluating post-conflict experiences, it may be wise to rethink the comprehensive peacebuilding strategy based on an integrated, coordinated and coherent approach.

Drawing from post-conflict experiences in several African countries, I should now like to share with the Council some thoughts on the main elements of a potential new post-conflict comprehensive peacebuilding strategy.

One of the key conditions for ensuring an exemplary transition from a situation of war to a situation of peace is helping countries emerging from conflict to take responsibility for their own affairs in the political, legal and institutional, security, economic and social spheres. It is therefore critical to create an enabling environment for the peace process by promoting dialogue and reconciliation between the various political actors.

The examples of Sierra Leone, Liberia and Timor-Leste illustrate post-conflict success. Such results are possible only if countries emerging from conflict have the means to achieve the objective of peace. It is in that context that the good offices and assistance of the international community, in particular the United Nations and regional organizations, are necessary.

I should like here to commend the considerable support of the United Nations to the process of restoring peace in several post-conflict countries in Africa. In Liberia, for example, the Economic Community of West African States and the United Nations Mission in Liberia together monitored the elections that marked the end of the terrible civil war in that country. The African Union, which will soon establish a framework for post-conflict reconstruction and development, has made significant efforts in this area, in cooperation with the subregional economic communities, by initiating and concluding numerous peace negotiations, as witnessed by the peace agreements concluded in Burundi, the Comoros, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Somalia, the Sudan and the Central African Republic.

Gabon has always promoted dialogue as the best way of resolving situations of crisis and conflict. For many years now it has been involved in the political processes of national reconciliation. For example, in the Central African Republic, Gabon successfully headed the inclusive political dialogue in December 2008 with the involvement of the main political forces of the country, which led to the establishment of a national reconciliation Government and an electoral timetable. The signing of peace agreements among the parties to a conflict is not enough to ensure that a peace process is permanent. It is also necessary to strive to ensure the respect and effective implementation, in good faith, of those agreements by the signatories.

In that regard, Gabon welcomes the operation, since 2006, of the Peacebuilding Fund, established to support the efforts of countries emerging from crises to rebuild, to strengthen peace and to respond to immediate threats to post-conflict peace processes.

In Africa, ethnic tensions are frequently among the main causes of conflict. In that context, in countries emerging from conflict, dialogue with the various ethnic groups must be maintained in order to preserve both national cohesion and territorial unity. Indeed, it is when all the ethnic characteristics are taken into account in drawing up a joint development project that the aspirations of populations, recently divided, can crystallize around a national ideal that contains the seed of a shared future. The example of Rwanda, which emerged from a genocidal crisis, is the perfect

illustration of a country of post-conflict internal reconciliation.

In order to achieve such a goal, peace processes must take into account security concerns, including by effectively implementing disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes. Likewise, it is important to ensure constant control of borders that, because they are porous, have become the scene of illicit activities and sources of conflict, such as drug trafficking, organized transnational crime and the unchecked and destabilizing circulation of small arms and light weapons.

In Central Africa, such illicit activities have a significant impact on the peace and security of our countries, in particular those emerging from conflict. In that regard, we welcome the fact that the Security Council, under Gabon's presidency, addressed such issues during its open debate on 19 March 2010 (see S/PV.6288).

In our view, a key element of a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy is for countries emerging from conflict to take on the political and security process. That is all the more evident as the other aspects of post-conflict reconstruction — promoting the rule of law, organizing free and transparent elections and economic and social governance — are largely dependent on a stable political and security climate.

As we routinely say, development is another name for peace and stability. A comprehensive post-conflict peacebuilding strategy must address the root cause of conflicts, which is poverty. From that standpoint, it would be desirable for the international community, in particular donor countries and international financial institutions, to further focus its financing on development programmes in those countries. The European Union is already doing that by setting up development hubs in some African countries, including the Central African Republic and Guinea-Bissau.

The economic and social development of countries weakened by conflict is absolutely crucial in order to put them back on the path of growth and to ensure the well-being of their populations, who have long suffered the agonies of war.

The Gabonese delegation supports the draft presidential statement to be endorsed following this debate.

Mr. Li Baodong (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): At the outset, I would like to thank the Foreign Minister of Japan for having travelled to New York to preside over today's meeting. I would like to thank Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon for his statement. I welcome Foreign Minister Rassoul of Afghanistan, the Minister of Defence of Sierra Leone, the Minister of Justice of Timor-Leste and the Managing Director of the World Bank and thank them for their statements. I would also like to welcome the presence of the Foreign Minister of Bosnia and Herzegovina at this meeting.

For some 12 years, the United Nations has actively contributed to post-conflict peacebuilding in the countries and regions concerned. It has achieved evident results and accumulated rich experience. Since the Security Council first discussed the issue of a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy in 2001, the international community has increasingly acknowledged that peacebuilding is a complex systemic project that involves the political, security, economic and social spheres, as well as many others, and that only a comprehensive strategy can produce effective results. Here, I wish to make the following points.

First, in promoting and implementing a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy, it is necessary to genuinely respect the ownership of the relevant country. As the party shouldering the primary responsibility for peacebuilding in its own country, the country concerned is not only the recipient of assistance, but also an equal partner with the donors in dialogue and cooperation, and its voice should be fully heard and heeded in setting priority areas of assistance.

The international community should take into full consideration the priorities set by the country concerned and formulate a corresponding peacebuilding strategy based on the situation on the ground. There can be no uniform norms for peacebuilding, and donors should not impose their own standards on a recipient country. In implementing a peacebuilding strategy, attention should be paid to capacity-building and personnel training in the country concerned and to fully utilizing that country's available human resources and expertise.

Secondly, in promoting and implementing a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy, it is necessary to coordinate peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding efforts. The Security Council should

invest more energy in preventive diplomacy so as to prevent the outbreak of conflicts in order to reduce the need for peacekeeping operations and post-conflict reconstruction. To secure a smooth transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding, the Security Council should consider peacebuilding issues as soon as it deploys a peacekeeping operation. At the same time, the division of labour between a peacekeeping operation and peacebuilding should be clear so as to avoid duplication of effort.

Thirdly, in promoting and implementing a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy, more attention should be paid to addressing the root causes of conflicts, in particular economic and social development. This year marks the tenth anniversary of the establishment and implementation of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by the United Nations. Judging from the current situation, achieving the MDGs is still a difficult task for many countries emerging from conflict: instead of seeing their economies improve, they find themselves lagging further behind other countries. That poses a new challenge in our peacebuilding efforts. In discussing comprehensive peacebuilding strategies, we should address not only security sector reform, justice and the rule of law, but also development. Only by helping countries emerging from conflict achieve sustainable development as soon as possible so that their populations can enjoy the peace dividend can we provide a solid political basis for peace processes.

Fourthly, in promoting and implementing a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy, coordination between multilateral institutions and donor countries must be strengthened. The United Nations should build stable cooperative relations with the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and other international partners so as to effectively integrate the resources of all players. The relevant United Nations organs, such as the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, should clarify their division of labour and strengthen cooperation. As an important body of the United Nations system responsible for post-conflict peacebuilding, the Peacebuilding Commission should play a greater role in coordinating the international community's peacebuilding efforts.

The Chinese delegation supports the adoption of the draft presidential statement at the end of this open debate, and I wish to thank the Permanent Mission of Japan for the efforts that it has made in that regard.

The President: I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Peter Wittig, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission and Permanent Representative of Germany, who will be the last speaker for this morning.

Mr. Wittig: I wish to thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this debate and for inviting me to participate in my capacity as Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). Japan, in its earlier capacity as Chair of the PBC, contributed immensely to building a strong case for the need for a comprehensive, integrated and multidimensional approach to peacebuilding. I will be brief, as I do not want to keep Council members any longer from their well-deserved lunch.

The Security Council should consider ways to maximize the use of the Peacebuilding Commission's advisory role. To this end, a stronger, organic and more dynamic linkage between the Council and the Commission is required throughout the various phases of the Council's consideration of certain situations on its agenda. Concretely, the Commission's advice on early peacebuilding activities carried out by peacekeepers could help the Security Council to clarify and monitor progress in the implementation of the mandates of peacekeeping missions.

By capitalizing on this viable mechanism for advice and monitoring, the Council would be able to focus on the most immediate threats to international peace and security while maintaining a closer and substantive watching brief on countries which have moved ahead on the continuum of peace. In doing so, the Council would be able to capitalize on the PBC's flexible working methods, thus enabling the Council to reach out more broadly to relevant actors at the country level.

Today, I would like to be put into practice some form of the Commission's advisory functions to the Council by sharing with the membership a few points emanating from the most recent activities undertaken by the PBC at the policy level.

A peacebuilding approach should be based on a common vision among the multiple actors usually engaged in a post-conflict situation. In promoting a common vision, and in addition to strengthening its

linkages with the Security Council, the PBC is increasingly focused on forging partnerships with the international financial institutions and major regional actors in order to help build coherence. We need to promote longer-term political and financial support that bolsters the nexus between security and socioeconomic development, and to ensure the delivery of concrete peace dividends. We need to support national ownership by focusing early attention on national capacity development, particularly in core Government functions. We need to deepen analysis of critical peacebuilding challenges and consistently identify potential threats to peacebuilding processes. And we need to focus attention on and address complex regional challenges to peacebuilding, such as narcotics and small arms trafficking.

Around each of these objectives, we need to take forward the work and tailor our responses to the specific needs of the country concerned and the will of its people. Our actions need to be demand-driven and their results must be nationally owned. For example, we will focus on and divide labour around critical such peacebuilding priorities as the security sector, the rule of law, reintegration, economic revitalization and youth employment.

The PBC will therefore continue to explore concrete measures to deepen the United Nations collaboration with the main actors at the country level. It will promote mutual accountability between host Governments and partners, and monitor progress towards meeting critical peacebuilding objectives. This work will require visible and sustained support from the Security Council, the general membership and the United Nations leadership. To this end, the PBC will continue to improve its working methods, sharpen and diversify its tools of engagement, and promote broader and more coherent engagement by its individual members.

We all know by now that peacebuilding is not a linear process and that it takes many years to build the national will, capacities and institutions needed to sustain peace. The lack of a common vision and coherence among the multiple actors in post-conflict situations is a real challenge that undermines our collective efforts to support countries on the path of sustainable peace. While the United Nations is only one among these actors, it carries the legitimacy and political weight that confer leadership upon its role in many post-conflict situations. We must live up to this image and to that expectation.

The President: There are still a number of speakers remaining on my list. I therefore intend, with the concurrence of the members of the Council, to suspend the meeting until 3.30 this afternoon.

The meeting was suspended at 1.25 p.m.